

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

W. KURRELMEYER

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

CONTENTS

	PAGE
WRIGHT, L. B.—Heywood and the Popularizing of History, - - -	287
WILLIAMSON, G.—Sir Thomas More's View of Drama, - - -	294
CAWLEY, R. R.—George Gascoigne and the Siege of Famagusta, - - -	296
MALONE, K.—Hunlafing, - - -	300
CLUBB, M. D.—The Second Book of the 'Cædmonian' Manuscript, - - -	304
JACKSON, J. H.—Oðinn's Meetings with Sigmundr and Sigurðr in the 'Volsungasaga', - - -	307
KURRELMEYER, W.—Another Letter from Tieck to Carus, - - -	308
DALE, G. I.—A Second Source of Lope's 'El Castigo del discreto', - - -	310
BOND, R. P.—A Triple Burlesque, - - -	312
STEARNS, HELEN.—The Date of the 'Garlande of Laurell', - - -	314
BARRET, P.—Shakespeare's Paraphrase of his 'Thought-executing Fires', - - -	316
TERRILL, T. E.—A Note on John Donne's Early Reading, - - -	318
HUGHES, HELEN S.—Another Letter by Horace Walpole, - - -	319
CASE, A. E.—The Model for Pope's Verses 'To the Author of a Poem Intituled 'Successio'', - - -	321
ZEITLER, W. I.—The Date of Spenser's Death, - - -	322
COOPER, L.—"A Note on 'Eastward Ho,' I, ii, 178", - - -	324
MUSTARD, W. P.—"Agrippa's Shadows", - - -	325
BOND, D. F.—The 'Essay on Man,' Epistle II, Lines 31-34, - - -	326

REVIEWS:—

S. A. TANNENBAUM, <i>The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore..</i> [T. W. Baldwin.]	327
J. S. P. TATLOCK and A. G. KENNEDY, <i>A Concordance to the Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer.</i> [R. J. Manner.] - - -	332
C. H. HASKINS, <i>The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century.</i> [G. R. Coffman.] - - -	336
A. KIHLMOM, <i>A Contribution to the Study of Fifteenth Century English, I.</i> [J. M. Steadman, Jr.] - - -	338
H. M. JONES, <i>America and French Culture, 1750-1848.</i> [M. Chazin.]	340
L.-P. GEOFFRION, <i>Zigzags autour de nos parlers.</i> [J. M. Carrière.] - - -	342
H. L. STEWART, <i>Anatole France, the Parisian.</i> [G. N. Henning.] - - -	344
H. GIBARD ET H. MONCEL, <i>Pour et contre le romantisme.</i> [M. Rudwin.]	346
G. H. DANTON, <i>Germany Ten Years After.</i> [E. Feise.] - - -	347
V. DAHLERUP, <i>Ordbog over det danske Sprog.</i> [K. Malone.] - - -	349
H. HERMANSSON, <i>Catalogue of the Icelandic Collection Bequeathed by Willard Fiske. Additions 1913-26.</i> [L. M. Hollander.] - - -	350
M. J. VAN DER MEER, <i>Historische Grammatik der niederländischen Sprache.</i> [E. H. Schrt.] - - -	352
J. POSTMA, <i>Tennyson, As Seen By His Parodists.</i> [L. W. Miles.] - - -	353

BRIEF MENTION - - - - -	354
-------------------------	-----

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year — Single Copy (Current) Seventy-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

EDITED BY

H. Carrington Lancaster, Gustav Gruenbaum, W. Kurrelmeyer,
and Raymond D. Havens

ADVISORY EDITORS

D. S. Blondheim, G. Chinard, E. Feise, J. C. French, E. Greenlaw,
K. Malone, J. Robles, R. B. Roulston, L. P. Shanks

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is
\$5.00 for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other
countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the
Editors of Modern Language Notes, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.
Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins
Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

The Romanic Review

Founded by

PROFESSOR HENRY ALFRED TODD

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL

Devoted to Research in the Romance
Languages and Literatures

Edited by

JOHN L. GERIG,

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,

New York

Subscription price, \$4.00 per year

PUBLICATIONS

of the

INSTITUT DES ÉTUDES
FRANÇAISES

G. L. VAN ROOSBROECK:

The Legend of the Deca-
dents \$1.50

A. H. KRAPPE:

Balor with the Evil Eye.
Studies in Celtic and
French Literature..... \$2.25

Send orders to: G. L. VAN ROOSBROECK,

501 PHILOSOPHY HALL,

Columbia University, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

the
nd.
ins

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLIII

MAY, 1928

Number 5

HEYWOOD AND THE POPULARIZING OF HISTORY

Among the Elizabethans, Thomas Heywood stands out in his effort to make literature easily understood by the commonality of readers. In him there is no despising of the intelligence of the bourgeoisie. In his serious productions he seeks to provide such explanatory equipment as will make clear all obscurities or difficult allusions. All of this he does without condescension, in a frank attempt to make enlightenment easy. Nowhere is Heywood's endeavor to popularize knowledge more apparent than in his historical and historical-biographical works. These publications he regarded as important to his literary reputation. Because he did not take sufficiently into account these very works, Mr. A. M. Clark¹ maintains that Heywood as a man of letters was "willing to trim his sails to any wind." Without repeating matter already touched upon by Mr. Clark, I wish to point out that Hey-

¹ "Thomas Heywood as a Critic," *MLN.*, xxxvii (1922), 217-223. Mr. Clark confines the bulk of his consideration to a comparison of Heywood's dramatic theory with his actual practice. He maintains that Heywood was an orthodox Sidneyean in theory, but that he regarded his plays as hack-work to which the rules did not apply.

Primarily a man of the theatre, Heywood wrote his plays as a practical dramatist, and did not, to be sure, regard them as works of literary art. That he regarded them as hack-work, as Mr. Clark insists, is to misinterpret the dramatist. As a commercial playwright, he did as the other dramatists of the day, even grumbling Ben Jonson: provided what public taste demanded. He looked upon his plays not as hack-work, but simply as belonging to another category from the productions which he himself regarded as literature.

wood worked as a serious literary craftsman with definite ideals of method and purpose, a fact which Mr. Clark seems unwilling to acknowledge. Like Shakespeare, Heywood looked upon his non-dramatic work as the source of his claim to be a man of letters. It is in the non-dramatic publications, largely overlooked by Mr. Clark, that one must seek his literary creed. In this discussion I shall be principally concerned with Heywood's ideals of writing as applied chiefly to his historical and biographical material.

In historical matter Heywood had a fundamental interest. He was cognizant of the value of history for its patriotic teaching and wished to present it in a brief and accurate form for the benefit of the general public. For him even traditional history had its nationalistic value: in *Troia Britanica or Great Britaines Troy* (1609) he traces anew the legend of Troynovant but mingles with it allusions to Henry V, Sir Richard Grenville, Drake, Frobisher, Hawkins, and other heroes. His *Life of Merlin* (1641) simply uses the old story of Merlin and his prophecies to present a chronological account of all the kings of Britain in such a fashion as to provide a popular compendium of British history.

Heywood anticipates modern makers of handbooks in the *Life of Merlin*. One of his literary goals, evident over and over, is the popularization of knowledge, especially historical knowledge. In the "Address to the Reader" of this work, the writer announces that he has made a convenient handbook for those who wish to be informed "in the knowledge of our English Annalls":

For in the steed of a large study book, and huge voluminous Tractate, able to take up a whole yeare in reading, and to load and tyre a Porter in carrying, thou hast here a small Manuell, containing all the pith and marrow of the greater, made portable for thee (if thou so please) to beare in the pocket, so that thou mayst say, that in this small compendium or abstract, thou has Holinshed, Polychronicon, Fabian, Speed, or any of the rest, of more Giantlike bulke or binding.

The narrative is straight-forward and unprejudiced even in the treatment of religious controversy.

In *The Exemplary Lives and memorable Acts of nine the most worthy Women of the World* (1640) Heywood had previously produced a pocket edition. He announced that "though I could

produce infinites to make this pocket booke rather voluminous then portable, let these nine serve to vindicate the entire number." The value of compression had manifested itself long before in the *Gunaikeion* (1624). As lengthy as this old history of women appears to a modern reader, it is a carefully condensed compendium of innumerable female biographies. In the address to the reader the author makes an explanation of the value of condensation:

Now if any aske, Why I have shut vp and contruded within a narrow roome, many large Histories, not delating them with euerie circumstance? I answer, That therein I have imitated Aelianus de Var. Hist. and Valer. Maxim. who epitomized great and memorable acts, reducing and contracting into a compendious Method wide and loose Histories, giuing them notwithstanding their full weight, in a few words.

He also wishes to make his biographies readable; hence,

I have not introduced them in order, neither Alphabetically, nor according to custome or president; which I thus excuse: The most cunning and curious Musick, is that which is made out of discords.

In imitation of the dramatic writers is the insertion of humorous material, "fabulous Jeasts and Tales."

As a writer in touch with the busy middle-class of his day, Heywood realized that the voluminousness of the chronicles was a deterrent to the popular reading of history. For this reason in the address "To the two-fold Readers" of *Troia Britanica* is a promise of brevity:

I have taskt myselfe to such succinctnesse and brevity, that in the iudiciall perusall of these few Cantons (with the Scolies annexed) as little time shall bee hazzarded, as profite from them be anyway expected.

With a scholar's realization of his limitations, Heywood apologizes for his lack of accuracy in the early legends reprinted in *Troia Britanica* and pathetically acknowledges the impossibility of treating fairly or accurately contemporary history. He warns his readers that he does not propose to hale in a confusion of histories of all nations but to provide

a briefe Index, or short Register, (to comprize many and the most noted things) and to conferre their times with our history of England: . . . onely thus much let me speake in my owne behalfe: with Ages past I have been too little acquainted, and this age present, I dare not bee too bold.

Heywood is modern ² in his feeling that fact ought to be reported faithfully without the coloring of personal bias. He is careful to reproduce even fictional matter as the stories have been handed down without the intrusion of personal opinion. In the *Gunai-keion* ³ he says of his method: "I answer to all in generall, I have only specified such things as I have read, and for my own opinion I keep it reserved."

An effort at attaining to some conception of a philosophy of history is evident in Heywood's works. However far he may have missed the modern historian's point of view in practice, in theory he was feeling toward unbiased and accurate historical account. It is significant that Heywood chose to precede his translation of Sallust's *Catiline* (1608) with a translation of Bodin's *Methodus ad Facilem Historiarum Cognitionem*, entitling it, "Of the Choise of History, by way of Preface, dedicated to the courteous Reader, vpon occasion of the frequent Translations of these latter times." Undoubtedly Bodin summed up Heywood's own conceptions of the historical method.

In one of his last works, *The Exemplary Lives*, etc., he presents a brief essay on history in an epistle to the reader. Since the work is rather inaccessible, quotation in full of the significant portions of the epistle may be worth while:

... History in generall, is either Nugatory as in all comicall Drammaes; or adhortatory, as in the Fables of Aesop, Poggius, &c. or fictionary, as in poetickall narrations: or Relatory, such as soly adheare to truth without deviation or digression; of which onely the ancient Gramarions ad-

² One finds the germ of a modern biographical method in Heywood's *Englands Elisabeth* (1631) in which he presents the early life and the influences upon Elizabeth during her minority which made for greatness as a queen:

"The prosperous and successefull reigne of this Royall Queen and Virgin hath been largely delivered in the Latine tongue, whereby all forein Nations have been made partakers of her admirable vertues and religious government. But for that part of her life, during her tender and sappy age, all our domestick remembrancers have been sparing to speak.

"As they have shewed you a Queen, I expose to your view a Princesse: they in her Majestie, I in her minority: they from the scepter to the sepulchre, as she was a Sovereigne; I the processe of her time from the cradle to the Crown, as she was a sad and sorrowfull subject."

³ 1657 ed., p. 301.

mitted, as worthy the name, and in which ranke I intreate thee to receive this following tractate.

Of History there be foure species, either taken from place, as Geography; from time, as Chronologie; from Generation as Genealogie; or from gests really done, which (not altogether unproperly) may be called Annologie: The Elements of which it consisteth are Person, place, time, manner, instrument, matter, and thing. . .

Simon Grinaeus speaking of the utilitie that ariseth unto us from the reading of History hath words to this purpose, What can be thought more pleasing or profitable then in this spacious Theater of humane life, for a man to instruct his understanding, by searching to know whatsoever is marvelously carried in all the parts thereof? To view the danger to others without any perill to himselfe, thereby to make him the more wise and cautelous? to make happy use of forreigne presidents and examples by applying them to his owne perticulars? to be as it were private with the greatest men, in their gravest counsell, and not onely privie to the purpose, but partaker of the event? To be acquainted with all the passages of state, the qualitie of times, the succession of Ages the vicissitude of both? The situation of countries, the original of nations? the rare liues of good Princes, the lamentable ends of Cruell Tirants? To make all that hath bene precedent, as familiar with us as the present, forreigne lands as well knowne unto us as that wherein we live: The arts of our forefathers as visible unto our eyes as were they now in being: As ours (if we shall doe ought worthy remembrance) commended to all the posteritie: briefly such is the benefit of History, that comparing what is past with the present, we may better prepare ourselves for the future.

Further to the exact composure of History, there belongs such an accurate curiositie, that whosoever shall attaine to the true method and manner, may boast he hath transcended Herodotus, Xipheline, Dio, Trogu Pompeius, Justine, Livy, Curtius, Tacitus, Swetonius, and even Caesar in his Commentaries: To all which I must ingeniously confesse I am so many degrees inferiour that I dare not list myself in the number of the Historygraphers being now rather a remembrancer or collector of some passages concerning the persons now in agitation.

One should observe the stress put upon the utilitarian purpose of history in the education of the citizen and servant of the state. In the dedication of *Catiline* to Sir Thomas Somersset, Heywood announces that the history is "for the pleasure of your vacanthowers, but especially for the generall good of all English Gentlemen" (italics mine). This conception of history as a cultural agent in English education recurs in the *Gunaikeion*.⁴

⁴ Bk. 3, p. 162.

But the purpose of my tractate, is to exemplify, not to instruct; to shew you presidents of vertue from others, not to fashion any new imaginary form from my selves.

He continues to emphasize that he sets forth all types of female biography in the hope that women may find some good to imitate and thus "every of you fashion her selfe as compleat a woman for vertue, as Apelles made up the pourtraiture of his goddesses for beauty." One of the chief values of plays, Heywood maintains in *The Apology for Actors* (1612) is their teaching of history.⁵

Since history does have such a value in the education of an Englishman, Heywood is greatly concerned with making historical matter easily accessible to the generality of readers. Further than this, he is a foe to obscurantism and seeks to present his material clearly and understandably. Always he is imbued with the sincere desire to popularize learning. Lest all of it be not clearly understood, Heywood appends explanatory notes at the end of each canto of *Troia Britanica*. At the end of the first canto he explains:

Our Poem, though familiarly knowne to them of iudgment and reading, yet because it may not seeme intricate to the lesse capeable, I thought it not altogether impertinent to insert some few observations to the ende of every Canto.

In a projected edition of his *Age* plays, the authors promised historical notes of explanation:⁶

If the three former Ages (now out of Print,) bee added to these (as I am promised) to make vp an handsome Volume; I purpose (Deo Assis-tente,) to illustrate the whole Worke, with an Explanation of all the difficulties, and an Historicall Comment of every hard name, which may appeare obscure or intricate to such as are not frequent in Poetry.

⁵ J. P. Collier's reprint, *Shakespeare Society* (1841), pp. 52-53: "... and what man have you now of that weake capacity that cannot discourse of any notable thing recorded even from William the Conqueror, nay, from the landing of Brute, untill this day? beeing possest of their true use, for or because playes are writ with this ayme, and carryed with this methode, to teach their subjects obedience to their king, to shew the people the untimely ends of such as have moved tumults, commotions, and insurrections, to present them with the flourishing estate of such as live in obedience, exhorting them to allegiance, dehorting them from all trayterous and felonious stratagems."

⁶ Epistle to the Reader, *The Iron Age*, Pt. 2.

A similar expression of a desire to make his work understood by all comes in the *Hierarchie of the Blessed Angells* (1635).⁷

Heywood makes a final and conclusive declaration for clarity in *Londini Status Pacatus* (1639) in which he states: "... in all my writing I labour to avoyd what is abstruse or obsolete." No tortured allegory or obscure reference is this man's goal. Though in practice he may fall short of his ideal, in theory he is an apostle of simplicity⁸ and conciseness in an age not much concerned over making its literary output easily intelligible to the populace.

The Johns Hopkins University.

LOUIS B. WRIGHT.

⁷ Bk. 1, p. 31: "That nothing in these short Tractates may appeare difficult to the Ignorant, I hold it necessarie vnto my present purpose, (as willing to be vnderstood by all) to illustrate whatsoeuer may seem obscure, as well by Precept as Historie. Which though the Learned may passe ouer, as things to them familiar and well knowne: yet vnto others, (neither frequent in reading nor well travelled in language;) no doubt but some of our marginal Annotations, with other particular Observations, may in their carefull perusall benefit such as reade not onely for fashion, but vse, and make it not their pastime but their profit. For that was the end to which Industrious Authors first aimed their Indeouours, and spent so much Inke and Oile," etc.

For further references to Heywood's desire to popularize knowledge, see my "Thomas Heywood: Spokesman of Middle-Class Ethics," forthcoming in *Studies in Philology*.

⁸ The plain-spoken Heywood, as much as he respects Latin, has no use for a display of pedantry. In the *Wise Woman of Hogsdon* (Act 4, Sc. 1) Taber says of Boniface and Sencer: "Nay sir, there are two Schollers, and they are spowting Latin one against the other; and in my simple Iudgement the stranger is the better Scholler, and is somewhat too hard for sir Boniface: For he speakes lowder, and that you know is euer the sign of the most learning."

Affectation in poetry he satirizes in *Loves Maistresse* (Act 1, Sc. 1):

... doe wee not daily see
Euery dull-witted Asse spit Poetrie.

Cf. also the satire of love poetry and the pastoral, Act 2, Sc. 1. In the *Fair Maid of Exchange* (if this is Heywood's) Frank says of Anthony Golding:

He hath perus'd all the impressions
Of Sonnets since the Fall of Lucifer
And made some scurvy quaint collection
Of fustian phrases, and uplandish words. . . .

(Pearson reprint, vol. II, p. 39).

SIR THOMAS MORE'S VIEW OF DRAMA

What Sir Thomas More, the friend of Erasmus, thought of the drama would be easier to surmise than we imagine, if we were obliged to adopt that course. What the portrayer of Richard III and of those realistic characters who come alive in his driest controversial treatises might have done had he ever turned his lively dramatic talent to the stage is as hard to predict as it is fascinating to imagine. But we may say that we know the view of drama which Sir Thomas More held, for a passage in his *Utopia* crystallizes our natural conjecture that he took the classic view. While the Miracle-Play, Morality, and Interlude were preparing the native soil which, with classical fertilization, was to produce Elizabethan drama, More set down the view which was to challenge that romantic drama in the classic bias of Sidney and the Countess of Pembroke and in dramatic activity as late as Thomas Kyd and Samuel Daniel.

More's view comes to us in "a fine and fitte similitude" which is incidental to the main thought of his *Utopia*. Near the close of Book I, Master Raphael and Master More are discussing whether philosophy has any place among kings. Master More admits that "this school philosophy hath not" and then qualifies his admission with the similitude. Imagination will serve us if we think of him as speaking to Shakspeare nearly a hundred years later: "But there is another philosophy more civil, which knoweth, as ye would say, her own stage, and thereafter ordering and behaving herself in the play that she hath in hand, playeth her part accordingly with comeliness, uttering nothing out of due order and fashion. And this is the philosophy that you must use. Or else whiles a comedy of Plautus is playing, and the vile bondmen scoffing and trifling among themselves, if you should suddenly come upon the stage in a philosopher's apparel, and rehearse out of Octavia the place wherein Seneca disputeth with Nero: had it not been better for you to have played the dumb person, than by rehearsing that, which served neither for the time nor place, to have made such a tragical comedy or gallimaufry? For by bringing in other stuff that nothing appertaineth to the present matter, you must needs mar and pervert the play that is in hand, though

the stuff that you bring be much better." This is the philosophy of the stage which Shakspeare and Elizabethan drama did not use, but which Thomas More would probably have used; unless, like Shakspeare, he had learned from the pit that "the stuff that you bring be much better." At any rate, this represents his view of drama, for it comes with the authority of "a fine and fitte similitude" which had to be as self-evident and true to him as the point he wished to make; he could not hazard his argument upon less.

Interesting as it is to know that this was the view of Sir Thomas More, it is of greater consequence to understand what this means in the history of literary criticism. Not only does this similitude anticipate Sidney's statement of the unities and decorum in his *Apology for Poetrie*, but it antedates Castelvetro's formulation of the dramatic unities by more than fifty years. More's statement is definite on the unity of action and non-mixture of the *genres*, and suggestive of the idea of decorum. To mix comedy and tragedy or to introduce matter not of a piece with the action is, in his view, to mar and pervert the play in hand. Related to this opinion is the general suggestion of decorum in the philosophy which, knowing her stage, "playeth her part accordingly with comeliness, uttering nothing out of due order and fashion." The philosophy in this passage suggests the humanistic relation of decorum to the conduct or courtesy books. *Comeliness*, though English for More's Latin, is perhaps a better word for decorum than the later *decency*. Even in its English translation More's statement is nearly a quarter of a century earlier than Castelvetro's, which preceded Sydney's. And Vida's inkling of decorum did not come till the publication of his *Poetics* in 1527, whereas the *Utopia* appeared in 1516. The presence in More's *Utopia* of partial anticipations of neo-classical doctrines is a further witness to the inquiring mind of this charming humanist and an interesting footnote to the history of literary criticism.

The worth of More's similitude as evidence of his view of the drama is increased by the signs of thinking on the subject of the theatre which it reveals. He knew, and doubtless had seen, Plautus and Seneca; and we must remember that John Heywood was his friend. In fact, More was probably writing as a critical observer of what he had seen in the drama of his time; the extravagances

which religious acrimony prompted on the contemporary stage evidently offended his esthetic taste more than his religious sense.

Prophetic of neo-classical criticism, this passage gives us a momentary vision of More's view of the drama and makes his *Utopia* even more "the true prologue of the Renaissance." But More does not forget a very English concession, "though the stuff that you bring be much better," which gives the devil his due and will let Shakspeare and Elizabethan drama into imperfect glory when they come short of classical unity.

GEORGE WILLIAMSON.

Stanford University.

GEORGE GASCOIGNE AND THE SIEGE OF FAMAGUSTA

On the occasion of the double marriage of the son and daughter of Anthony Brown, first Viscount Mountacute, George Gascoigne was invited to provide a masque. Eight gentlemen, friends of the Viscount, had gone so far as to buy the materials for their costumes, and to have them cut after the Venetian fashion. Having reached that stage of preparation, they appealed to Gascoigne to devise a masque which should make those costumes appropriate. The versatile poet, in complying, made happy use of a contemporary incident. On August 15, 1571, Famagusta, in Italian possession, had fallen before a determined and bloody assault of the Turks under Mustapha Bashaw. A Venetian, Count Nestore Martinengo, had been present at the siege and had written a lurid, though prejudiced, account of it, which was published at Verona in 1572 under the title of *L'Assedio et presa di Famagosta*.¹ In that same year the pamphlet was translated into English by William Malim, headmaster successively of Eton and St. Paul's. The title page reads, *The true Report of all the successe of Famagosta, of the antique writers called Tamassus, a Citie in Cyprus. In the which the whole order of all the skirmishes, batteries, mines, and assaults geven to the sayd Fortresse, may plainly appeare. . . . Englished out of Italian by William Malim. . . . Imprinted at London by John Daye. An. 1572.* It is a thin quarto of only sixteen folios,

¹ The book was translated into French in the same year. The German translation bears neither date nor place of publication.

with a lengthy dedication to the Earl of Leicester followed by a brief description of the Island of Cyprus.

This book must have come into Gascoigne's hands because he incorporates parts of it in his *Maske for the Viscount Mountacute*.² His devise consists in having a fictitious relative of the Mountacutes return from the siege of Famagusta where his roving father had been killed and where he himself, taken captive by the Turks, had been liberated by a group of noble Venetians, happily Mountacutes also, who had escorted him to his native England. The boy then appeared with his rescuers at the double wedding, and recounted what he, an eye witness, had experienced at Famagusta. As Martinengo was likewise an eye witness, Gascoigne lets the two careers run in several respects parallel. After describing the city's fall, young Mounthermer-Mountacute goes on:

I styll a slave remaind,
To one, which Prelybassa hight. (p. 80.)

Martinengo says:

I offered, and gave my selfe slave to one Sangaccho del Bir.
(fol. 13v.)³

Set free by the noble Venetians, the boy exclaims:

To thinke what joye then pierst my heart, and how I thought me blest.
To see that cruell Turke which held me as his slave,
By happie hand of Christians, his paiment thus to have. (p. 81.)

And Malim, in his dedication:

The late blowes, which the Turkes have receaved since this their fury, in
token of Gods wrath against them, much comforteth every Christian hart.
(fol. A ivv.)

Near the end of his dramatic story the youth says:

I was in sackcloath I, nowe am I cladde in Golde,
And weare such roabes, as I my selfe take pleasure to beholde. (p. 83.)

² A devise of a *Maske for the right honorable Viscount Mountacute*. Published originally in *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, London, 1573. Republished in *The Complete Works of George Gascoigne* (ed. J. W. Cunliffe, 2 vol., Cambridge, 1907), I, 75-86. I have used this rather than B. M. Ward's beautiful edition of *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*, printed in 1926 at the Shakespeare Head Press, because it reproduces Gascoigne's revisions of 1575.

³ References are to the original edition, mentioned above in the text.

Martinengo:

I for my part being clothed in Sackcloth, whereas soone after by the great courtesie of the right honourable Sig. Latino Orsino, I was new appparelled accordingly. (fol. 16.)

Gascoigne also draws parallels between the father's career and Martinengo's. Thus:

In Rhodes his race begonne. . . .

Yea though the peece was lost. . . .

At Chios many knowe, how hardily he fought. (p. 76.)

Martinengo:

It mouveth me much to remember the losse of those 3. notable Ilands . . . : namely Rhodes. . . . Scio or Chios being lost. . . . And now last of all . . . Famagosta. (fol. A iv.)

After his capture the elder Mounthermer had to pay heavily for his ransom:

He bought his libertie with Landes, and let his goodes ago.

Zechines * of glistening golde, two thousand was his price. (p. 77.)

* A peece of golde like the Crusado.

Martinengo:

I offered, and gave my selfe slave to one Sangaccho del Bir, promising hym 500.* Zechins for my raunsome. (fol. 13v.)

* Zechini, be certaine peeces of fine golde.

And finally, when the Turkish fleet was bearing down on his little craft, the father's exhortations recall Malim's marginal comment. He,

Gan cleane forget all wayling wordes, as lavishe of his breath.

And to his Christian crewe, this (too shorte) tale he told,

To comfort them which seemde to faint, and make the coward bold.

(p. 78.)

Malim:

The forwardnesse of the Captaine at daungerous times not onely much comforteth the common soldier, but also increaseth greatly his credite and commendation with all men. (fol. 8v.)

The passage, however, in which Gascoigne has borrowed most freely from *The true Report* is the one describing the horrible fate of Famagusta's governor:

G.

I sawe the noble * *Bragadine*, when
he was *fleyd quicke*.
First like a slave enforst to beare
to every breach,
Two baskets laden full with earth,
Mustaffa * dyd him teach.
By whome he might not *passe* before
he *kyst the grounde*,
These cruell tormentes (yet with
mo) that *worthy souldior* found.
His eares cut from his head, they
set him in a *chayre*,
And from a *maine yard* hoisted him
aloft into the *ayre*,
That so he might be *shewed* with
crueltie and spight,
Unto us all, whose weeping eyes dyd
much abhorre the sight. (p. 80.)

* The governour of Famagosta.
(p. 80, marg. note.)

* The generall of the Turkes. (p.
80, marg. note.)

M.

The noble *Bragadino* (fol. 2v.)
[repeated five times, 3v., 10, 12,
12v., and 13.]

Thys *worthy* and *pacient* gentle-
man *Bragadino* was led still in the
presence of that unfaythfull tyrant
Mustafa, to the batteries made unto
the Citie, whereas he being com-
pelled to *carrye two baskets of earth*,
the one upon hys backe, the other
in hys hand *slave like*, to every
sundry battery, being enforced also
to *kisse the ground* as oft as he
passed by him, was afterward
brought unto the Sea side, where
he being placed in a *chaire* to leane
and stay upon, was winched up in
that chaire, and fastened unto the
Maineyarde of a Galley, and *hoisted*
up with a Crane, to *shew him to*
all the Christian soldiers and slaves
(which were in the haven already
shipped) he being afterward let
down, and brought to the market
place, the tormentors tooke of hys
clothes from hym, and tacked hym
unto the Pillary, whereas he was
most cruelly *fleyed quicke*.

(fols. 13v.-14.)

From that *worthy* and noble *Braga-
dino* . . . hys eares were cut of.

(fol. 13.)

The *worthy* *Bragadino*. (fol. 12.)

Sig. *Bragadino* was . . . *Gouvernour*.

(fol. 2, marg. note.)

Mustafa him selfe *generall* of the
Turkes armie. (fol. 3.)

The following are a few incidental parallels:⁴

⁴ A few details in his later description of the Battle of Lepanto Gascoigne may have taken from Martinengo's story of the actual siege. Thus, "The wilde fire works are wrought and cast in foemans face," p. 81, (cf. "We being nothing behind or forgetfull to cast wildefire amongst them," fol. 9); "The smoulder stops our nose with stench," p. 81, (cf. "Thys fire

G.

The Christian enemye, the Turke.
(p. 76.)

The fertile coastes of Cyprus soile.
(p. 77.)

The Turke that Tirant he (p. 78.)

the walles
Of famous Famagosta * (p. 78.)

* The chiefe Cittie in Cyprus.

To heare those hellishe fiendes in
raging blasphemie,
Defye our onely Saviour, were this
no miserie? (p. 78.)

M.

Those cruell Turkes, auncient pro-
fessed enemies to all Christian Re-
ligion. (fol. A ivv.)

This Iland [Cyprus] is thought to
be very riche, abundant of Wine,
Oyle, Grain, Pitch, Rosin, Allum,
Salt. (fol. B ii.)

That tyraunt Mustafa.

(fol. A ivv.)

That unfaythfull tyrant Mustafa.

(fol. 13v.)

Famagosta the cheefe holde and
fortresse in Cyprus. (fol. A ivv.)

There were in time paste 15. Cities
or famous Townes in it [Cyprus],
but now very fewe, amongst the
which Famagosta is the cheefest.

(fol. B iv.)

Mustafa talking with hym, and
blaspheming the holy name of our
Saviour. (fol. 13.)

ROBERT RALSTON CAWLEY.

Princeton University.

HUNLAFING

The proper name *Hunlafing* occurs in v. 1143 of *Beowulf*, in a passage the meaning of which has been much debated. Since the interpretation of the name has an important bearing on the interpretation, not only of the passage in question, but also of the Finsburg episode as a whole, a study of the name *Hunlafing* ought to be of some interest and value, to Beowulfian scholars at least. In the following I will try to present such evidence as is available and draw such conclusions as the evidence presented seems to justify.

It must be said at once that the reading *Hunlafing* is not the only possibility. Bugge¹ and others have suggested the reading

continued 4. dayes, wherefore we were enforced by reason of the extreme heate and stinche, to withdraw our selves." (fol. 9v.)

¹ PBB., XII, 32.

Hun Lafing, the first name being thought to be that of a warrior, the second that of a sword. But since this reading has latterly been abandoned by all the editors and commentators, and seems no longer to be looked on with favor in any quarter (for excellent reasons, of course, which I need not go into), I will leave it out of my discussion, and confine myself to the reading *Hunlafing*. Broadly speaking, this reading can be interpreted in two ways: one may take the word to be a personal name, or a sword-name. From a strictly formal point of view, either interpretation is legitimate. The suffix *-ing* is not infrequent in personal names, and is regularly used in the formation of patronymics; it is also regular in the formation of sword-names. Naturally, then, the learned have fallen into two camps, according to whether they took *Hunlafing* for a personal name or for a sword-name.

Cosijn seems to have been the first to suggest that *Hunlafing* was a personal name; I know his suggestion only at second-hand, through Boer's brief discussion in the *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*.² Boer agrees with Cosijn; he takes *Hunlafing* for a patronymic, with reference to either Guðlaf or Oslaf of v. 1148. In other words Guðlaf and Oslaf were brothers; Hunlaf was their father; either Guðlaf or Oslaf, therefore, might properly be called *Hunlafing* 'son of Hunlaf.' This hypothesis was shattered by Chadwick, who pointed out³ that according to the Scandinavian records Hunlaf was brother, not father, of the other two heroes.⁴ If *Hunlafing* is a patronymic, then, the son of Hunlaf must be a nephew of the heroes mentioned in v. 1148, and the nephew's true name has not come down to us; we know him only by his patronymic. The existence of Hunlaf as a saga-hero is confirmed, not only by the *Skjöldunga*, but also by an English reference dug up by Imelmann, and printed in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*.⁵ We may therefore feel assured that the *Hunlafing* of *Beowulf* is to be connected with Hunlaf. But is the reference to Hunlaf's son, or to Hunlaf's sword?

² XLVII, 139.

³ H. M. Chadwick, *Origin of the English Nation*, p. 52, note 1.

⁴ Arngrímur's epitome of the *Skjöldungasaga*, ed. A. Olrik, in *Aarbøger for nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie*, 1894, p. 107.

⁵ XXX, 999. The latinized name of the hero occurs in the gen. sg., as *hunlapi* (doubtless for *Hunlaphi*).

One cannot answer this question offhand. It is needful first to study the usage of the English poet in parallel cases. And if we do this we discover that the poet never uses a patronymic except in connexion with the true name. Mostly the patronymic follows immediately after the true name: Scyld Scefing (4), Higelac Hreþling (1923), Hæðcen Hreþling (2925), Wulf Wonreding (2965). Once it occurs, after but not immediately after the true name, as a variation: Sigemundes (875), Wælsinges (variation, 877). Nowhere do we find a patronymic used alone. Two personal names in *-ing* occur, it is true, *Hem(m)ing* and *Swerting*, but they are not patronymics, but perfectly ordinary names, whatever their ultimate etymology. If we turn to the *Heimskringla* we find a Hemingr Hákonarson and a Hemingr Strútharaldzson, together with a Svertingr Rúnólfsson; similarly, the *Landnámabók* records five Svertings, but none with a Svartr for father. Again, the Hemingr of the "Helgakviða Hundingsbana II" is son of Hundingr. Clearly in Scandinavian usage these were true names, not patronymics, and we have every reason to think the same of the *Hem(m)ing* and *Swerting* of the English poet.⁶

Such evidence as *Beowulf* affords, then, is wholly against the interpretation of *Hunlafing* as a patronymic. We may go further. The use of a patronymic alone is a practice foreign to Old Germanic custom and inherently improbable to the highest degree in the present case. An Icelandic friend of mine, Dr. Stefán Einarsson (i. e., Stefán son of Einar), tells me that in present Icelandic speech it is impossible to call him simply Einarsson; the patronymic cannot be used independently, but must be preceded by the true name. This rule is without question a survival of the Old Germanic system of nomenclature. As we have seen, it holds for *Beowulf*, and, so far as I can discover by an extensive though not exhaustive search, for Old English poetry generally. These things being true, the interpretation of *Hunlafing* as a patronymic cannot be maintained.

There remains the possibility that *Hunlafing*, like *Swerting*, is a true personal name, and not a patronymic. This seems to be the view of Huchon,⁷ although he does not make the point clear.

⁶ For the variation between single and double *m* in *Hem(m)ing*, see A. Noreen, *Altisl. Gram.*⁴ § 318. No emendation is needed in *Beowulf* 1961.

⁷ R. Huchon, in *Revue Germanique*, III, 626, note 1.

Chambers also apparently had something of the sort in mind, when he published his edition of *Widsith*,⁸ but in his *Beowulf*, published in 1921, he interprets *Hunlafing* as a patronymic. He tells us, "We now know (and this I think should be regarded as outside the region of controversy) that the warrior who put the sword into Hengest's bosom was Hunlafing. And about Hunlafing we gather, though very little, yet enough to help us. He is apparently a Dane, the son of Hunlaf, and Hunlaf is the brother of the two champions Guthlaf and Ordlafr."⁹ If we are to justify the first sentence of this quotation, we must modify the last, on some such theory as that Hunlafing, not Hunlaf, was the brother of Guðlaf and Ordlafr (Oslaf), in spite of the *Skjöldunga*. Indeed, we must abolish Hunlaf altogether. Such a course obviously does violence to the records. But even so it does not solve the problem. As a personal name, Hunlaf is familiar enough, but Hunlafing is unknown. Apart from the *Beowulf* passage under discussion, it nowhere occurs. Our only rational course, then, is to give up *Hunlafing* as a personal name, and turn to the alternative hypothesis, according to which it is a sword-name.

So far as I know, the first to advance the theory that *Hunlafing* is a sword-name was Axel Olrik,¹⁰ who interprets the name as meaning 'the sword owned by Hunlaf,' and compares the Scandinavian sword-names *Høking* 'sword owned by Hókr' and *Tyrfing* 'sword owned by Torfi.' After the hero's death the sword would pass into another's possession, of course, but would retain its old name, or, better, it would at that time receive the name which linked it for ever with its former owner. Olrik further points out that the other two swords mentioned by name in *Beowulf* both have names in *-ing*. Olrik's interpretation of *Hunlafing* was apparently familiar to Chadwick, who remarks, "Hengest himself is in possession of a sword called Hunlafing."¹¹ Since Chadwick says nothing more on the subject, he evidently thinks the case closed. Björkman, who seems to have been ignorant of Olrik's discussion, attributes the sword theory to Chadwick, and gives him

⁸ R. W. Chambers, *Widsith*, p. 254.

⁹ R. W. Chambers, *Beowulf*, p. 252.

¹⁰ In *Danmarks Heltedigtning*, I (1903), 68.

¹¹ *Op. and loc. cit.*

short shrift: "Chadwick hält *Hunlafing* für einen Schwertnamen, eine ganz unwahrscheinliche und unnötige Annahme."¹² He gives no grounds for this astonishing (not to say preposterous) judgment, but his attitude is typical of that of the bulk of Beowulfian scholars in this matter. As for me, I accepted Olrik's interpretation of *Hunlafing* in both my studies of the Finsburg episode,¹³ and my belief in Olrik's interpretation has been strengthened at each renewed study of the problem.

KEMP MALONE.

THE SECOND BOOK OF THE 'CÆDMONIAN' MANUSCRIPT

In his introduction to the facsimile of MS. Junius XI,¹ Sir Israel Gollancz describes carefully the way in which Books I and II are joined in the seventeenth gathering. His explanation renders inescapable the conclusion that the scribes of the second book intended that their work should be considered a continuation of Book I, as Junius himself believed. Hence Book II could not have been originally a wholly independent MS.

Gollancz is certainly wrong, however, in his contention that the folding which produced the ridge across all the folios of Book II preceded the copying of the poem. The following points will make clear this error. (1) The cramped writing of the sixteenth line on pp. 226, 227, and 228 can be matched on the same pages in other lines at considerable distance from the ridge.² (2) Note that the faintness of the ink in l. 16 on these three pages should not be

¹² In Morsbach's *Studien zur engl. Philologie*, LVIII, 75 f.

¹³ *Lit. Hist. of Hamlet*, I, 20 ff.; *JEGP.*, XXV, 157 ff.

¹ *The Cædmon Manuscript of Anglo-Saxon Biblical Poetry, Junius XI in the Bodleian Library*. . . . Published for the British Academy by . . . Oxford University Press, MCMXXVII. See pp. xcviii-xcix.

² On p. 226 compare the script of l. 16 with that of l. 21; on p. 227 compare ll. 16-17 with ll. 18-26; on p. 228 compare l. 16 with most of the lines on the upper two-thirds of the page. For the probable cause of this cramped writing, see my *Christ and Satan*, p. xiii.

It should be mentioned that the various points made in this discussion are based upon an examination of a rotograph of Book II which is clearer even than the facsimile.

confused with the question of cramped penmanship. This faintness, which appears in portions of the sixteenth line on several pages, is undoubtedly due to the effects produced on the ink of the vertical strokes by the repeated bending and unbending of the parchment. (3) There is no unequivocal evidence, such as one would surely expect to find, that a preëxisting fold has on any of the leaves of Book II caused the ink to run, or disturbed the direction of the scribes' strokes, many of which, especially in the high or tailed letters, cross the folds. Occasionally, on the contrary, as can be seen at the beginning of p. 214, l. 16, the fold has caused easily visible cracks in the ink of the long, heavy strokes. (4) If more positive evidence is required, let the reader examine the beginning of l. 16, p. 223, where the fold has become so heavy that it has overlapped the lower portions of several letters. Note also the crushed appearance of the middle section of l. 16, p. 222. The fact, noted by Gollancz, that the effects of this ridge have been 'communicated to' pp. 229-30 and some of the concluding pages of Book I is not surprising when one considers the length of time during which all these leaves have been bound up together.

It seems hazardous to attempt any explanation of the folding of pp. 213-28, or to seek to draw from the mere fact of such folding, conclusions in regard to the early history of the codex. It is entirely possible that these pages, which comprise most of the seventeenth gathering, became loosened from the rest of the book in its original binding, and were then folded and inserted somewhere among the other leaves of the volume for safe keeping, only to be re-sewn in their proper place, either while the codex still retained its early binding, or later when it was re-bound in the fifteenth century.

The question whether the LWS. 'Corrector' of Book II also occasionally altered the text of Book I has some bearing on the history of the MS. Clearly, as Professor Gollancz says (p. xxix), it is "wellnigh impossible that the same hand that in *Christ and Satan* was answerable for the dialect change of 'io' from 'e,' in 'wercum' and 'werpan,' in *Genesis* changed 'liod' and 'niotan' to 'leod' and 'neotan.'" (See p. 214, ll. 3 and 27; p. 12, l. 14; p. 21, l. 17.) The fact is, one cannot be at all sure that the 'Corrector' is responsible for the two forms in *Sat.* Moreover, one can be practically certain that the hand which altered *liod* and

niotan is not the same as that which made most of the normalizations of pp. 1-26. Since, as Gollancz implies quite justifiably, more than one person may have been involved in the correcting of Book II, the same may well be true of Book I. In any case, this single discrepancy would not by itself be a refutation of the statement "that there are traces in the *Genesis* of the hand of the Late West Saxon corrector who was so active in *Christ and Satan*." The important question is whether some of the corrections of *Gen.* actually resemble those made by the corrector of Book II. Let the reader compare the form of the letters in the corrections found in the following lines: p. 9, l. 11, with p. 218, l. 14, and p. 215, l. 2 (*ge*); 14. 1, 14. 18, 18. 4 with 213. 21, 215. 19, 219. 10 (*e*); 14. 17, 42. 9 with 227. 1 (*a*); 14. 24 with 226. 20 (*he*); 19. 3 with 215. 5, 227. 2 (*y*); 18. 12 with 214. 23, 228. 15 (*t*); 14. 5, 21. 17 with 213. 13, 214. 16 (*eo*); 18. 25 with 221. 17 (*stede*). Note especially the method of correction used in the forms of the word *heofnen*, 18. 12 and 213. 6, and the script of *utan*, 19. 21.

Gollancz assumes (p. xxix) the existence of an 'Annotator' to account for the glosses found in these lines: 213. 11; 216. 20; 217. 15, 19, 27; 218. 2, 3, 14. But the form of the letters in these additions is so exactly similar to that found in the 'Corrector's' work that the glosses and most of the corrections may reasonably be assigned to one hand. Compare the script of *wæron* (218. 19), which G. ascribes to the Corrector, with that of *pær* (218. 3), listed as the Annotator's. The reduction in size and heaviness of stroke which is apparent in these additions is easily to be explained by the probability that the Corrector would write his emendations more heavily than his glosses. Note that after two of the annotations (i. e., in 217. 15 and 218. 14) the writer has properly added the hemistichal dot in the same way as the Corrector has placed the dot after his alterations in 215. 13 and 218. 19.

MERREL D. CLUBB.

Miami University.

ÓÐINN'S MEETINGS WITH SIGMUNDR AND SIGURÐR
IN THE *VOLSUNGASAGA*

On p. 114 of *The Heroic Age* (1912) Professor Chadwick writes:

"The *Völsunga Saga* brings him [Óðinn] into contact with Sigmundr on two occasions: first when he enters *Völsungr's* hall at the wedding feast and plants in the tree a sword which Sigmundr alone is able to draw out (cap. 3), and again in his last battle when the hero's sword is shattered at the touch of Othin's javelin (cap. 11). Twice also the same saga makes him meet with Sigurðr: first when he chooses for him the horse Grani (cap. 13), and later when he accompanies him on his way to attack the sons of Hundingr (cap. 17; cf. also cap. 18)."

In addition to the two meetings of Óðinn and Sigmundr here mentioned, another occurs in cap. X, when Sigmundr bears the body of Sinfjötli, who has been poisoned by his step-mother, to the fjord:

Sigmundr . . . tók líkit í fang sér ok ferr til skógar ok kom loks at einum firði; þar sá hann mann á einum báti litlum; sá maðr spyrr, ef hann vildi þiggja at honum far yfir fjörðinn; hann jatar því. Skipit var svá lítit, at þat bar þá eigi, ok var líkit fyrst flutt, en Sigmundr gekk með firðinum. Ok því næst hvarf Sigmundi skipit ok svá maðrinn.¹

Professor Chadwick says that Óðinn also met Sigurðr *twice*, although he cites a reference to a third meeting. This occurred while Sigurðr was digging a pit into which he could get to kill Fafnir: Sigurðr gerði gröf eina, ok er hann er at þessu verki, kemr at honum einn gamall maðr með síðu skeggi ok spyrr, hvat hann gerir þar, hann segir; þá svarar inn gamli maðr: þetta er óráð, ger fleiri grafar ok lát þar í renna sveitann, en þú sit í einni ok legg til hjartans orminum!—þá hvarf sá maðr á brottu.²

Professor Chadwick adds, "In all these cases alike the god's identity is not suspected, at least until after his departure." Yet in two of the instances this does not seem conclusive. After Óðinn broke Sigmundr's sword in two with his javelin and Sigmundr had been mortally wounded, Hjördis came to the battlefield and asked if he were to be healed. He answered plainly, "Vill Óðinn ekki, at vér bregðum sverði, síðan er nú brotnaði."³ There is nothing in

¹ *Die Prosaische Edda*, ed. Wilken, Paderborn, 1912, Vol. I, 167, 3 ff.

² *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, 179, 6 ff.

³ *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, 169, 16-17.

the text to indicate that Sigmundr did not know from the first that he had been visited by Oðinn. Likewise when Sigurðr was on his way to attack the sons of Hundingr,⁴ he and his men (*þeir*)—including Reginn in the *Reginsmál*—asked Oðinn his name before they took him aboard their ship. He answered that he was Hnikar and that they might call him Feng or Fjölur (*Reginsmál* 18). In *Grimnismál* 47,⁵ Oðinn gives himself both the names *Hnicarr* and *Fjölur*. Feng does not seem to occur elsewhere. But even if the voyagers did not recognize any of the three cognomens of Oðinn, the fact that the storm, which had been fierce and threatening, subsided as soon as he came on board must have made them suspect that they were in company with the chief of the gods.

JESS H. JACKSON.

University of Texas.

ANOTHER LETTER FROM TIECK TO CARUS

In the February Number of *MLN*. Professor Zeydel published three letters from Ludwig Tieck to C. G. Carus, apparently the only ones hitherto brought to light. In looking through a collection of autographs of German authors, acquired some years ago, I discovered two letters of Tieck, one of which is likewise addressed to Carus. It is on gray paper, 9 × 15 inches, with the letter J as a watermark in the centre of the sheet. The outer fold bears the address: "Herrn Hofrath Dr. Carus Hochwohlgeb. Allhier." The letter, which had been sealed with red wax, bears in the upper left corner the notation, either of the recipient or of a later owner, N. 30.¹ The text is as follows:

⁴ *Op. cit.*, Vol. I, 177, 6 ff.

⁵ Bugge, *Sæmundar Edda*, Oslo, 1926.

¹ I must express my doubts concerning Professor Zeydel's dating the first of his letters as of the year 1821, on the strength of the recipient's notation 4, 21. If this is a date, I should interpret it as April 21, year unknown. In that letter, moreover, Tieck alludes to a performance of *Lear*: now Herman v. Friesen, in his *Ludwig Tieck*, Wien, 1871, after recording first performances of various other Shakespearean plays at Dresden, states (I, 74): "Endlich wurde am 25. März 1824 'König Lear' gegeben." On the basis of this, I do not see how the first Zeydel letter can be dated earlier than the year 1824.

Geehrtester Freund,

Können Sie uns heut um 6 Uhr das Vergnügen machen, zu uns zu kommen, so will ich versuchen, Ihnen den Lear, den Sie neulich wünschten, vorzulesen. Verzeihen Sie, daß Sie mei. Vorschlag so spät erhalten, der Vorsatz wird immer so spät gefaßt, daß ich es nicht früher machen konnte.

Ihr

ganz ergebener
L. Tieck.

Samstag früh.

It is not difficult to date this letter. In Friedr. v. Raumer's *Historisches Taschenbuch*, Neue Folge, 6. Jahrgang, 1845, pp. 193-238, there is an article by G. C. Carus: *Ludwig Tieck. Zur Geschichte seiner Vorlesungen in Dresden*. On pp. 208, 209, Carus writes:

Glücklicherweise sind mir von den verschiedenen Gedankenzügen, die mir diese Abende erregten, einige Erinnerungsblätter geblieben, welche vor manchem Jahre unmittelbar nach solchen Abenden, und zwar oft noch in später mitternächtlicher Stunde niedergeschrieben worden sind; diese gebe ich denn hier. . . . Am öftersten hat mich der britische Dichter veranlaßt, meine Gedanken, wie sie, während Tieck seine Werke uns las, in mir aufstiegen, nach der Lectüre niederzuschreiben. Ich lasse diese Aufsätze gleich hier und zwar nach der chronologischen Ordnung, in welcher sie geschrieben sind, mitfolgen, und glaube ihnen weitere besondere Einleitungen nicht voraussenden zu dürfen.

Abends den 28. October 1827.

Nach dem Lesen vom Lear.

"Durch Sturm, Regen und Finsterniß komme ich zurück von Tieck, wo der Lear vorgelesen wurde.

Ein solches Lesen, wo das Stück recht mit einemmale wie ein aufgerolltes Palmenblatt sich ausbreitet, hat seine besondern Vorzüge, und zumal heute fand ich Alles so zusammenstimmend: wenig Menschen, nicht zu helle Erleuchtung; draußen, wie im Lear selbst, arges Regenwetter, zwiefach niedergießend, aus Dachrinnen und Traufen, deren Wasser vom Winde trübselig gegen das Fenster geworfen wurde, nur zuweilen vom dumpfen Rollen der Wagen übertönt."

As October 28, 1827, moreover, fell on a Saturday, the day mentioned in the letter, we may be reasonably sure that this was the invitation to the reading just described.

W. KURRELMAYER.

A SECOND SOURCE OF LOPE'S *EL CASTIGO
DEL DISCRETO*

Bandello's *novella* 1, 35 as the source of Lope de Vega's *comedia* *El castigo del discreto* was announced recently by W. L. Fichter¹ and repeated later in the study preceding his edition of the play.² In the latter work Professor Fichter compared the *novella* and *comedia* and indicated that there were many differences between the two. He says that "Some of these differences were indicated by the exigencies of Lope's theatre; others were the result of his own creative fancy."³ "The friar he converted into a young gallant such as was typical in the *comedia*."⁴ "In the *novella*, for example, Bandello gave no indication of motivation for Casandra's action. Lope, however, distinctly motivated her fall from grace, showing her from the first to be a neglected wife who had good reason to become susceptible to her husband's praise of his gallant rescuer."⁵ He then speaks of the rôle which Casandra's jealousy plays, and at the close of his study he adds: "Although his amours and neglect of his wife could not, according to the prevailing code, excuse similar failings on her part, they did foster an inclination to seek attention elsewhere. More imprudent even was his excessive praise of the stranger, motivated though it was by his gratitude, since such approval served to inspire his wife's lapse from virtue."⁶

Obviously the "praise" motif is significant; in fact the plot gets under way immediately after Casandra hears the stranger praised by her husband, Ricardo. This is not an original device with Lope. Attention has already been called elsewhere⁷ to the resemblance of the first story of Ser Giovanni's *Il Pecorone* to an episode in the Moorish tale *Historia del Abencerraje y la hermosa*

¹ *RR.*, 1925, xvi, 185-186.

² Lope de Vega's *El castigo del discreto*, together with a study of conjugal honor in his theater. Instituto de las Españas. New York, 1925.

³ P. 24.

⁴ P. 26.

⁵ P. 26.

⁶ Pp. 70-71.

⁷ J. P. W. Crawford, Un episodio de "El Abencerraje" y una "Novella" de Ser Giovanni. *Revista de Filología Española*, 1923, x, 281-287.

Jarifa. Lope's comedia *El remedio en la desdicha* is based on this tale which, he implies, he obtained from the *Diana* of Montemayor, but the event: "nos calificaron por verdadero las Corónicas de Castilla en las conquistas del reino de Granada."⁸ The episode in question, wherein a gentleman praises a neighbor to his wife so highly that she becomes amorously interested in him and by letter arranges a secret meeting with him, does not appear in the *Diana* version of the Moorish tale, nor does it appear in the only extant copy of the *Corónica* which has come down to us as a fragment and which ends before the proper place for the episode to be introduced.⁹ Where Lope read the "praise" episode, whether in the *Inventario* of Villegas (which seems doubtful, although Menéndez y Pelayo believed that Lope knew this version,¹⁰) or in the printed *Corónica* (if it really appeared there) it is impossible to determine. It does seem obvious, however, that Lope made slight use of it in *El remedio en la desdicha* when he developed the sub-plot of the love affairs of Narváez and Alara.

If it can be granted that Lope was familiar with the "praise" episode, it becomes easy to see how he has cleverly combined material from two sources in *El castigo del discreto*. The principal characters, Ricardo, his wife Casandra, and the lauded stranger Felisardo are all in their proper rôles. It is not necessary to convert the friar of Bandello into "a young gallant such as was typical in the comedia." The writing of a letter by Casandra to Felisardo arranging a rendezvous may also have been suggested by the episode in the Moorish tale. What is most significant is the importance of the "praise" element in motivating Casandra's "fall from grace." Without it we should have only the jealousy of a neglected wife, a device which, though not infrequently employed in developing plots of comedias,¹¹ could hardly have enabled Ricardo

⁸ *Dedicatoria to El remedio en la desdicha*, ed. Clásicos castellanos, vol. 39, 2-5.

⁹ The *Corónica* is reproduced in facsimile in *Bulletin Hispanique*, 1923, xxv, plates III-X.

¹⁰ *Obras de Lope de Vega* publicadas por la Real Academia Española, xi, xxxvii.

¹¹ Cf. H. Alpern, "Jealousy as a Dramatic Motive in the Spanish Comedia," *RR.*, 1923, xiv, 276-285. This article does little more than indicate the frequency of the jealousy theme.

to decide "on a milder and yet adequate punishment" (his first thought was to punish her by death) "when he realizes that his praise of the man is responsible for her change of heart and constitutes a grave indiscretion on his part."¹²

It is quite probable therefore, that the differences between the Italian *novella* and *El castigo del discreto* are in a large measure due to the utilization of the "praise" theme with which Lope was familiar.¹³

GEORGE IRVING DALE.

Cornell University.

A TRIPLE BURLESQUE

The first half of the eighteenth century saw the publication of an extraordinary number of burlesque poems in the form of mock-heroics and parodies, Hudibrastics and travesties. This sophisticated movement had as its motif the creation of an incongruity between style and subject. Coming in 1751, at the end of a long development in burlesque writing, the *Old Woman's Dunciad*, undoubtedly by William Kenrick, is an instance of combined burlesque which is probably unique.

Kenrick had begun his career of catholicity in enmities; his libelling was to include such men as Fielding,¹ Johnson, Garrick, and Goldsmith. Christopher Smart had had a very large part in *The Midwife, or the Old Woman's Magazine* (usually adopting some variant of "Mary Midnight" as a pseudonym), and in 1750 and 1751 his blank verse poems had captured prizes at Cambridge. "Drawn by Newberry into the vortex of Grub Street animosities, Smart further conceived an 'Old Woman's Dunciad,' but he was anticipated in this by William Kenrick, who used the idea to pay off a grudge against its originator, whereupon Smart abandoned the design."²

¹² Lope de Vega's *El castigo del discreto*, ed. cit., p. 22.

¹³ Longfellow's "Galgano," it may be of interest to add, is based on Ser Giovanni's version of this episode. Cf. E. Goggio, "Italian Influences on Longfellow's Works," *RR.*, xvi (1925), 215-220. Also J. P. W. Crawford, "El Abencerraje" and Longfellow's "Galgano," *Hispania* (California), ix (1926), 165-169.

¹ To whom the *Old Woman's Dunciad* was ironically dedicated.

² *DNB*, Thomas Seccombe's article on Smart. The basis for this state-

The full title of this rather scarce piece is worth giving:³

The so much talk'd of and expected Old Woman's Dunciad. Or, Midwife's Master-Piece. Containing the most choice Collection of *Humdrums* and *Drivellers*, that was ever expos'd to public View. By Mary Midnight. With Historical, Critical, and Explanatory Notes, by Margelina Scribelinda Macularia. Publish'd pursuant to Act of Parliament, as the greatest Work ever before attempted in any *Age, Country, or Language*.

The heroic couplet is the natural verse form for any work with "Dunciad" in its title, but blank verse is here used, perhaps in ridicule of Smart's prize-winning efforts. The remarkable thing about this satire is its use of three kinds of burlesque: the regular text (184 ll.) is in the most extravagant Miltonics, greatly Latinized and in many places hardly intelligible; underneath the text the "Interpretation" (199 ll.) lucidly repeats in Hudibrastic couplets the matter of the text; at the foot of the page burlesque prose annotations discuss the text, mocking the sort of thing Bentley did with *Paradise Lost* and comparable to many of the notes in the *Dunciad* and to William Dodd's annotations in his *New Book of the Dunciad*, 1750.⁴ It is not uncommon to find burlesque footnotes accompanying burlesque poetry, but the presence of two metrical versions, each done with some skill, alongside burlesque commentary, places Kenrick's performance, as far as I can determine, in a class apart.

The poem is a description of Dulness in her cave with her two sons. Smart and two others, whom it is difficult to identify with certainty today, are lampooned with a savagery that finally descends into sordidness. The most delightful feature of the entire production is the diction of the exaggerated Miltonisms, such as "The *Student's Honour circumclangor'd wide With Buccination*" and

ment is a note on line 183 in Kenrick's *Pasquinade*, 1753; the preface to the *Old Woman's Dunciad* contains an explanation of Mrs. Midnight's stratagem in anticipating her enemies "to their utter confusion" and refers to the poem as her own idea, thus enhancing the joke. Cf. an advertisement at the end of the third number of the *Midwife*, Dec., 1750.

³ I have used the British Museum copy. A third edition in the same year is recorded by Halkett and Laing as in the Bodleian.

⁴ Many of these notes are really amusing, especially those of verbal criticism and the explanation of the purpose of the "Interpretation," namely, academic convenience. But reasons of space forbid reproduction here.

"Assist the Trump of Fame debilitate With Garrulations." Three pairs of examples will show how the two versions carry out the opposing methods of burlesque by the use of language which in the one case elevates, and in the other degrades, the subject.

Which porcuffed *Ulysses* vagrant train!

And turn'd *Greek* Sailors into Pork! (p. 13)

in Dormitation mounts

Aquiline Wings, and in Etherial Space

Builds castral Edifices.

Fancies himself an Eagle there,

And raises Castles in the Air. (p. 15)

Behold, with gloomy Brow, contracted Frown,

In hypocondriac cephalalgiae vext,

He sits contristate; manducating Thoughts

In vacca! Ruminatio.

See, down i' th' Mouth, with Brow contracted,

With Head-ach and the Hip-distracted,

He sits in the Dumps; so ruminating

As thoughtless Cows do when they're eating.

(pp. 19-20)

Certainly this work has a claim to distinction among the most singular "ever before attempted in any *Age, Country, or Language*." One may even hope that it will remain *sui generis*.

RICHMOND P. BOND.

Harvard University.

THE DATE OF THE *GARLANDE OF LAURELL*

The *Garlande of Laurell* is the only poem by John Skelton which is known to have been published during his lifetime. The date of the edition is 1523, and it was done by Faukes. The poem contains a long list of his works, many of them now lost, and it consequently furnishes a definitive date for the poems mentioned therein. The prefatory lines state that it was "studyously dyuysed at Sheryhotton Castell, in the Foreste of Galtres." From the content, we learn that it was written at a time when Elizabeth, Countess of Surrey, was living at the castle with her train of ladies, who are named in short separate poems.

There are two kinds of evidence which go to prove that the poem was written in April, 1523. Dyce says concerning the dating: "The date of its composition is unknown; but it was certainly produced at an advanced period in his life." The first type of evidence is largely deductive. 1523 furnishes a definitive date beyond which we cannot go. We know from the poem itself that it was written in the spring, when the weather was warm enough to permit Skelton to indulge in a nap in the forest of Galtres.

That, me to rest, I lent me to a stumpe
Of an oke, that sometyme grew full streyghte . . .
Whylis I stode musynge in this medytatyon,
In slumbrynge I fell and halfe in a slepe . . ."

The poem later describes the presentation to Skelton of a garland woven by the Countess and her ladies. Therefore it is safe to assume that it could not have been written earlier than April, whatever the year. Evidently the Countess, with a train, was occupying the home of her father-in-law, the Duke of Norfolk. But we know from the State Papers that the Earl of Surrey and his family resided in Dublin from 1519 to 1522. He brought his wife and children with him when he became Viceroy in 1519, and they remained in Dublin Castle until his government closed in the middle of April, 1522. He then settled his family in Tendring Hall, as his "Catering Book" shows. In December he was made Lord Treasurer at the resignation of his father, and in February, 1523, he was commissioned general-in-chief of an army raised for the invasion of Scotland. All through the spring and summer he was occupied in raiding the Borderside. Albany had left Scotland to seek aid in France, and the advantage was seized to negotiate with the Scottish nobles, to detach the Queen Mother and the friends of the young King from Albany, and to weaken the Regent's power. From this time on, the State Papers show that he was stationed at Newcastle, on the border between England and Scotland. Thus external evidence shows that the poem was probably written in the spring of 1523, at the time when his family were living at Sheriff Hutton, the most available northern seat.

The internal evidence is still more conclusive. In true mediæval fashion, the poem opens with an astronomical dating:

Arctyng my syght towarde the zodyake,
The sygnes xii for to heholde a farre,
When Mars retrogradant reversyd his bak,

Lord of the yere in his orbicular,
 Put up his sworde, for he coude make no warre,
 And whan Lucina plenarly did shyne,
 Scorpione ascendynge degrees twyse nyne.

Through the kindness of Professor Schlesinger of the Astronomy Department of Yale University, I have been able to date the poem from the passage above. Mars retrogrades once in every two years. The poem was published in the fall of 1523. The opposition of Mars in 1926, the most recent year of retrograding, was 1926.84. To bring it back to a time previous to 1523 we subtract the number of synodic periods which have elapsed since then, and we have 1523.25, or a quarter of the year 1523, which is April. This confirms the previous conclusions, but still more confirmatory is the fact that working back from this point every two years brings the retrograding of Mars to February, 1521, and the earliest possible date is November, 1514. It is only in 1523 that we have Mars retrograding in April. So both internal and external evidence point to April, 1523, as the date for the composition for the *Garlande of Laurell*.

HELEN STEARNS.

Yale University.

SHAKESPEARE'S PARAPHRASE OF HIS THOUGHT-EXECUTING FIRES

You sulphurous and thought-executing fires,
 Vaunt-couriers to oak-cleaving thunderbolts, *Lear*, III, ii, 4-5.¹

What does *thought-executing* mean in Lear's address to the storm that is to reduce him to a "fever of the mad"? Does it mean (1) "doing execution with rapidity equal to thought"² or (2) "executing the thought of Him who casts you"³?

It seems possible to use Shakespeare's own words in support of (1) on the basis of a parallel passage in the *Tempest*. In Act I, sc. ii Ariel reports the storm to Prospero, who asks (ll. 206-210):

¹ All Shakespeare quotations are taken from Aldis Wright's Cambridge Edition.

² Johnson. See Variorum, Vol. v, 1880, p. 171.

³ Moberly. See Variorum, Vol. v, 1880, p. 171.

Pros. My brave spirit!
Who was so firm, so constant that this coil
Would not infect his reason?

Ariel. Not a soul
But felt a fever of the mad and play'd
Some tricks of desperation.

Since it is impossible to read this passage without remembering the infection of Lear's reason brought about by a similar storm so great that "man's nature cannot carry the affliction nor the fear," would it not be equally impossible for Shakespeare to have written it without so remembering?

A comparison of the description of the storm in *Lear* and in the *Tempest* reveals striking parallelism:

<i>Lear.</i>	<i>Tempest.</i>
1. You sulphurous . . . fires.	1. Fires and cracks of sulphurous roaring
2. Vaunt-couriers to oak- cleaving thunderbolts	2. Precursors o' the dreadful thunder-claps
3. Thought-executing fires	3. Momentary and sight out- running

Act I, sc. ii. (201-204)

In each case three ideas are used to describe lightning. Two of them are identical. Lightning is (1) sulphurous and (2) precedes thunder. In the *Tempest* there can be no doubt as to the meaning of the third attribute. Lightning is transient and quicker than sight.

If, then, Shakespeare had Lear's storm in mind when composing the storm scene in the *Tempest*, if of the three ideas he used to describe lightning in both instances, two are identical, is it not more than probable that the third is in the same vein? If in the *Tempest* he thought of lightning as quicker than sight, is it not highly likely that this is a reflex of the corresponding passage in *Lear*? And in this case it would seem that "momentary and sight-outrunning" is Shakespeare's own paraphrase of "thought-executing."

PRINGLE BARRET.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

A NOTE ON JOHN DONNE'S EARLY READING

It will be recalled that the motto above Donne's eighteen year old picture was in Spanish. There has been much speculation about it, and the words have been variously translated by Walton, Gosse, and half a dozen others. The words are, "Antes muerto que mudado."

I have discovered that the source of this motto is Montemayor's *Diana*, and, considering the context, there can be no further doubt as to the meaning of the words. They occur in the last stanza of the first song, and are the words Diana wrote on the sand in pledging her troth to Sirenus:

Sobre el arena sentada
De aquel río la vi yo
Do con el dedo escribió:
"Antes muerta que mudada."
Mira el amor que ordena
Que os viene hacer creer
Cosas dichas por mujer
Y escritas en el arena.

Seated upon the sand
Of that river I saw her
When she wrote with her finger:
"Rather dead than changed."
Look you what love ordains,
That comes to make you believe
Things said by woman
And written in sand.

Gosse's translation, "Before I am dead how shall I be changed,"¹ and Miss Ramsay's French, "Combien dois-je changer, avant que je meure,"² always unwarranted by the plain words, thus become impossible nonsense. Only Keynes, Donne's bibliographer, has made even a passable translation, "Sooner death than change," which does not distort the meaning.

Donne's interest in *La Diana* may be said to have been lifelong, for in a letter written about 1616 he says, "I begin to be past hope of dying: and I feelee that a little rag of Monte Magor, which

¹ Gosse, *Life and Letters*, I (1899), p. 24.

² *Les Doctrines Medievales chez Donne*, 1924, p. 38.

I read last time I was in your chamber, hath wrought prophetically upon mee, which is, that Death came so fast towards mee, that the overjoy of that recovered mee."³ This is from the fifth song, Silvano's lines:

. amor que lastimandome
Jamaz canso, no impede el acordarseme
De tanto mal, y muero en acordandome.
Mire a Diana, y vi luego abreviarseme;
El placer y contento, en solo viendola,
Y a mi pesar la vida vi alargarseme.

Love which tormenting me
Never took rest, hinders me not the remembering
Such a great sickness, I die in recalling it.
I looked at Diana, and saw then my cutting short;
Contentment and pleasure was only in seeing it,
And to my grief then, I saw life lengthening.

I can also show that Donne traveled in Spain and was at the court before 1595, but since the evidence requires more time and space to present than the limits of this note would warrant, the proof must be deferred until my thesis on the Spanish Influence on John Donne is completed.

T. EDWARD TERRILL.

Harvard University.

ANOTHER LETTER BY HORACE WALPOLE

A letter of Horace Walpole's which I do not find has been published is preserved among the *Percy Family Letters and Papers* (Vol. 32, p. 170) at Alnwick Castle, to which I recently had access through the generosity of the Duke of Northumberland. It is addressed to that Duchess of Northumberland who appears from time to time in Walpole's correspondence, sometimes the subject of his jests for her "jovial magnificence"; sometimes his hostess, as at the fête for the Queen's brother in 1762,—“quite a fairy scene”; sometimes his companion, as on the occasion of the visit to the Cock Lane Ghost.¹

The present letter from Walpole to the Duchess suggests a neigh-

³ C. E. Merrill, Jr., *Letters to Several Persons of Honor*, 1910, p. 254.

¹ In 1759 he sent her a copy of his *Fugitive Pieces* and of his *Catalogue*

borly conversation—perhaps at Sion House but a short distance from Strawberry Hill—concerning the history of the herald's office. Walpole writes to give her the benefit of his antiquarian researches. The tone of the letter, friendly and deferential, is at variance with that of his satirical description of the lady in 1764 in his *Memoirs of the Reign of King George the Third*. The letter reads as follows:

Strawberryhill
April 2d 1760

Madam

The account of *Percy-Heralds* which I had the honour to mention to your Ladyship yesterday, is in a book called a *Collection of curious Discourses written by eminent Antiquarians upon several heads in our English antiquities*. These pieces were published by T. Hearne in 1720. In one of the tracts called *The Duty & Office of an Herald of Armes* It is said p. 263. that in the time of King Henry 4th among a few others was *Percy-Herald*: & in the reign of Edward 4th p. 265. that the Earl of Northumberland had *Northumberland-Herald*: as He had given under Henry 7th when it is particularly recorded that none even of the great Peers had *Heralds* but the Earl of Northumberland; even the Lord Marquis (of Worcester) having but a *Pursevant*. I flatter myself that these additional proofs of the greatness of yr Ladyship's House will not be unacceptable, as the Discovery is a satisfaction to & an evidence of the attachment of

Madam

Yrs Ladyship's

Most obliged & obedient humble

Servant and Tenant

Hor Walpole

One surmises that this information was acceptable to the future "vice-majesties of Ireland," as Walpole delighted to term the Duke and Duchess in a letter to Horace Mann in 1763. Their fondness for traditional splendor he had described to the same correspondent in 1752: "They live by the etiquette of the old peerage, have Swiss porters, the Countess has her pipers—in short they will soon have no estate. (*Letters*, vol. III, p. 128.)

HELEN SARD HUGHES.

Wellesley College.

of *Royal and Noble Authors*. The gift is acknowledged in a letter from the Duchess (*Letters of Horace Walpole*, ed. Toynbee, *Supplement*, vol. III, p. 160), expressing esteem for the author, and concluding with reference to the *Catalogue*, "[I] am truly grateful for your gratifying my impertinent curiosity upon that subject."

THE MODEL FOR POPE'S VERSES TO THE AUTHOR OF
A POEM INTITLED 'SUCCESSIO'

Pope's verses *To the Author of a Poem intitled 'Successio'* were first published anonymously in *Miscellaneous Poems and Translations, by Several Hands*, in 1712. When the first edition of his collected works was published in 1717 Pope omitted this satire, perhaps, as Roscoe suggests,¹ because he feared that it might be regarded as an attack on the Hanoverian dynasty, in honor of which Settle had written *Successio*. In any case, although the authorship of the verses seems to have been no secret,² they were omitted from all the English editions of the works until Roscoe restored them in 1824.³

Roscoe and the subsequent editors of Pope have, however, overlooked one fact in connection with the satire. In *Miscellaneous Poems and Translations* it was preceded by the lines *On Silence*, and the two poems were described as *Two Copies of Verses, Written some Years since in Imitation of the Style of Two Persons of Quality*. *On Silence* has long been recognized as an imitation of Rochester's *On Nothing*, but no one has attempted to identify the model for the second poem. It is, quite clearly, Dorset's *To Mr. Edward Howard, on his incomparable, incomprehensible Poem, called 'The British Princes.'* The full extent of the likeness between the two poems is apparent only when they are read in their entirety, but some of the more striking parallels of thought and expression are given below.

Come on, ye critics, find one fault who dares;

—Dorset.

Begone, ye critics, and restrain your spite,

—Pope.

¹ *The Works of Alexander Pope, Esq.* (London, 1824), II, 55.

² They are included in the presumably unauthorized Dublin edition of Pope's works published by Grierson in 1727, and Warburton, in 1751, acknowledged their authenticity in his note on *The Dunciad*, I, 182, although he did not reprint the satire.

³ They were called to his attention by Isaac Disraeli, *Quarrels of Authors* (London, 1814), I, 298 ff. (I have seen only the New York edition, of the same year, in which Disraeli's discussion of the authorship will be found at I, 169-79.)

Thy style's the same, whatever be thy theme,
As some digestions turn all meat to phlegm:

—Dorset.

Wit pass'd through thee no longer is the same,
As meat digested takes a diff'rent name;

—Pope.

Therefore, dear Ned, at my advice, forbear
Such loud complaints 'gainst critics to prefer,
Since thou art turn'd an arrant libeller;
Thou set'st thy name to what thyself dost write;
Did ever libel yet so sharply bite?

—Dorset.

Therefore, dear friend, at my advice give o'er
This needless labor; and contend no more
To prove a *dull succession* to be true,
Since 'tis enough we find it so in you.

—Pope.

ARTHUR E. CASE.

Yale University.

THE DATE OF SPENSER'S DEATH

The date commonly given for the death of Edmund Spenser, January 16, 1599, is based on a letter written in London on January 17, 1599, according to the postscript; the writer, John Chamberlain, made this statement to his correspondent, Sir Dudley Carlton: "Spenser, our principall poet comming lately out of Ireland, died at Westminster on Satterday last."¹ This extract, unquestionably authentic, has been constantly misinterpreted because of the change in calendars in 1752, when Great Britain adopted the Gregorian or New Style calendar and ordered the day after September 2 to be numbered September 14. In 1866 the publication of J. J. Bond's *Handy-Book of Rules and Tables* provided this information and a perpetual calendar (1066-1866), showing that January 1, 1598-9, came on Monday; January 17 fell therefore on Wednesday, and "Satterday last" meant January 13.² The editor of the *Gentleman's Magazine* had reached the same

¹ *Letters written by John Chamberlain*, edited by Sarah Williams, for the Camden Society, 1861; p. 41.

² Bond, p. 95 and 262.

conclusion in November, 1850, but included "evidence" against it in the following footnote appended to J. P. Collier's article called "Chaucer's Tomb: Spencer's Death": "The Saturday before the 17th January, 1598-9 O.S. was, we believe, the 13th January. But according to the autograph evidence of Henry Capell adduced by Todd (Spenser, i. cxxix), Spenser died 'apud diversorium in platea Regia apud Westmonasterium juxta Londinium 16^o die Januarij, 1598.' The day of Spenser's death seems therefore to rest uncertain between these two days, the 13th and 16th January, 1598-9."³

This editor inadvertently wrote the correct form "Londinium" instead of "London" in the original, which adds more bad Latin in the following phrase: "Juxtaq; Geffereum Chaucer, in eadem Ecclesia supradict. (Honoratissimi Comitiss Essexiae impensis) sepelit."⁴ This seems to have been deliberately distorted to conceal borrowing from Camden's *Annales* (1615), which says: "Westmonasterii prope Chaucerum impensis Comitiss Essexiae inhumatus."⁵ Likewise "in platea Regia" is probably nothing more than a literal translation of three words in Ben Jonson's *Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden* (1619), where Spenser is said to have "died for lake of bread jn King street."⁶ The date was obviously made up from Chamberlain's letter with reference to the New Style calendar, which makes January 17, 1598-9 fall on Sunday. Grosart made this calculation independently, rejecting the Capell "autograph evidence" as one of J. P. Collier's "innumerable pseudo-entries and proved forgeries" because he found it quoted without acknowledgement in the latter's edition of Spenser, and had not seen the original passage.⁷ Todd said it was "communicated by the learned and reverend John Brand, Secretary of the Society of Antiquaries" from the title-page of his own copy of the *Faerie Queen*, second edition (1596),

³ *Gentleman's Magazine*, xxxiv, 487.

⁴ Rev. H. J. Todd, *Works of Edmund Spenser*, 1805; i, cxxix.

⁵ *Annales . . . regnante Elizabetha*, 172; quoted in F. I. Carpenter, *A Reference Guide to Edmund Spenser* (1923), 43.

⁶ Ben Jonson, ed. C. H. Herford and P. Simpson (Oxford, 1925), i, 137.

⁷ A. B. Grosart, *Complete Works of Edmund Spenser* (1882), i, 236: "This *juxta London* as descriptive of Westminster is suspicious"; J. P. Collier, *Works of Edmund Spenser* (1862), i, cxlv.

"which appears to have belonged originally to Henry Capell; after whose autograph, the date of 1598 is added . . . Henry Capell has added *apud diversorium* in the paler ink with which his own name is written." No one but Brand has ever mentioned such an entry, and Musgrave's *Obituary* has no record of a Henry Capell living in 1598-9.⁸ If Brand, who was only eight years old in 1752, was responsible for this forgery, he forgot the change of calendars from Old Style to New Style. Grosart, making the same mistake honestly, has been followed by almost all biographers and editors to date, but in future the day of Spenser's death should be stated correctly as January 13, 1599.⁹

W. I. ZETTLER.

Harvard University.

"A NOTE ON *EASTWARD HO*, I, ii, 178"

In a note with this title (*MLN.*, Jan., 1928, pp. 28-9), Professor Robert Withington unaccountably fails to cite the recent edition of *Eastward Hoe* by Dr. Julia Harris (Yale Studies in English, No. 73, 1926), and thereby has missed perhaps more illuminating allusions to the elephant and castle than he himself gives from sources near in time to the play. He could, of course, have taken one of the two allusions given by Miss Harris (p. 114) from Bullen, from whom she takes it: "See Burton, *Anat. of Mel.*, ed. 1660, p. 476, 'To put a thousand oaks and an hundred oxen into a suit of apparel to wear a whole manor on his back.'" The other parallel she finds to "Pray heauen, the *Elephant* carry not his Castle on his backe" she records as in *Miseries of Inforced Marriage* (Dodsley 5.24): "A cheating rascal will teach me, . . . they that have stalked like a huge elephant with a Castle on their necks."

⁸ *Harleian Soc. Publ.* (1899), XLIV, i, 341. Sir Henry Capel, K. B., of Tewkesbury died in 1696; the date of his birth is unknown (*DNB.*, III, 926).

⁹ Carpenter accepts Grosart's date in his *Reference Guide*, p. 22, but mentions J. W. Hales in Chambers's *Encyclopaedia* (1897), who says merely this: "On January the 13th (not the 16th, as is usually said; see John Chamberlain to Sir Dudley Carlton, January 17, 1599) he died." See Chambers, 1927 ed., IX, 582.

Why not add Ben Jonson (*Discoveries*, ed. Castelain, p. 18) on Hearsay News?—

That an elephant, '630, came hither Ambassadour from the Great *Mogull* (who could both write and read) and was every day allow'd twelve cast of bread, twenty Quarts of *Canary sack*, besides Nuts and Almonds the Citizens' wives sent him. That hee had a *Spanish Boy* to his Interpreter, and his chiefe *negotiation* was, to conferre or practise with *Archy*, the principall fool of *State*, about stealing hence *Windsor Castle*, and carrying it away on his back if he can.

For the earliest references in English to elephants and castles, see Bosworth-Toller, *Anglo-Saxon Dict.*, s. vv. *ylp* and *wig-hūs*.

LANE COOPER.

Cornell University.

"AGRIPPA'S SHADOWS"

In the second prologue of Lyly's *Campaspe* there is a rather obscure allusion to "Agrippa his shadowes, who in the moment they were seene, were of any shape one would conceiue."

Here "Agrippa" seems to be Cornelius Agrippa of Nettesheim (1486-1535), who was accounted a great magician or necromancer. And his "shadowes" must be the shades of the dead which he was said to call up at will. Compare the very similar allusion in Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, I, 1, where Faustus says he

Will be as cunning as Agrippa was,
Whose shadowes made all Europe honor him.

There is a good note on these two lines in Dr. A. W. Ward's edition, Oxford, 1901, pp. 113-15.

Perhaps the best commentary on the *Campaspe* passage would be a reference to Thomas Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveller*, where some of Agrippa's necromantic feats are recorded (ed. Grosart, V, 75-77; McKerrow, II, 252-53).

W. P. MUSTARD.

The Johns Hopkins University.

THE *ESSAY ON MAN*, EPISTLE II, LINES 31-34

Contemporary and later comment on Pope's lines in Epistle II of the *Essay on Man*,

Superior beings, when of late they saw
A mortal man unfold all nature's law,
Admired such wisdom in an earthly shape,
And showed a Newton as we show an ape,¹

has been divided between the seeking of far-fetched comparisons and severe berating of Pope for "likening Newton to an ape."

It is not necessary to go to Plato or to the *Zodiac* of Palengenius, as ingenious commentators have done, to find the "source" for such an idea.² The conception of a "vast chain of Being," extending from celestial creatures down to the lowest animal, was so widespread in Pope's day that there could seem nothing more natural than the comparison which the poet makes.³

A passage in the *Spectator*, No. 621 (Nov. 17, 1714), illustrates the wide currency of the idea, and parallels most closely the much-discussed passage in the *Essay on Man*:

If the Notion of a gradual Rise in Beings, from the meanest to the most High, be not a vain Imagination, it is not improbable that an Angel looks down upon a Man, as a Man doth upon a Creature which approaches the nearest to the rational Nature. By the same Rule (if I may indulge my Fancy in this Particular) a superior Brute looks with a kind of Pride on one of an inferior Species.

DONALD F. BOND.

Washington University,
St. Louis.

¹ Elwin-Courthope, II, 378.

² Warton, *ibid.*

³ Cf., among others, Archbishop William King's *De origine mali*, 1702 (English translation, *An Essay on the Origin of Evil*, London, 1731, pp. 83-85) and Addison, *Spectator*, No. 519 (Oct. 25, 1712).

REVIEWS

The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore. A Bibliotic Study. By SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM. New York: The Tenny Press, 1927. Pp. vii + 135.

In *The Booke of Sir Thomas Moore*, Dr. Tannenbaum continues his valuable series of acute studies on disputed documents in the Elizabethan period. Here he produces evidence to substantiate his claim (1) that he has identified the three still missing "authors" in the play, (2) has established the exact date of the play, (3) has shown the purpose of the play, and (4) why it was never completed, as also (5) why Tyllney "refused to permit it to be acted," (6) that he has shown that Kyd did not cease writing for the stage in 1587, (7) and that his patron was Ferdinando Stanley, the fifth Earl of Derby, (8) from which it follows that Kyd, Marlowe, and Dekker were writing for Strange's company in the early nineties.

All these conclusions except parts of (1) are based fundamentally on the identification of hand C as that of Thomas Kyd, and must stand or fall with that identification. But that identification is impossible both because Kyd could not have written some of the things which are in hand C, and because the prompter of the Shakespearian company, Thomas Vincent, has docketed some of the work in this hand as his own.

Dr. Tannenbaum, on the basis of handwriting, would identify the hand which, as all critics so far agree, wrote the plot of the *Seven Deadly Sins*, hand C in the play of *Sir Thomas More*, and the now fragmentary plot called *Fortune's Tennis* as that of Thomas Kyd. In the case of *Fortune's Tennis*, other facts would seem to make this identification impossible. These center around the date of the plot, which Sir Edmund Chambers would place about 1602, and Dr. Greg as almost certainly after October 1597, both attaching it to the Admiral's men.

Fortune's Tennis would seem certainly to have belonged to the Admiral's men, since five out of the seven actors mentioned in the fragmentary plot—Singer, Tailor, Cartwright, Charles, and Sam—were certainly all together at one time in the organization, while both probability and the records would seem to make it clear that they were never together in any other organization. That Charles and Sam are Charles Massye and Samuel Rowley is evident from the fact that these actors appear consistently as Charles and Sam in a plot of June 3, 1597, and with the addition of "Mr." in two other later plots, all three known to belong to the Admiral's men. Since *Fortune's Tennis* belongs to the Admiral's, George can also

be identified as George Somerset, who appears regularly c. 1598-1602 as a manly attendant, though he has also wrongly been made a "child." That the plot belongs about this period 1597-1602 is shown by the fact that although actors, especially the hired men, shifted rather rapidly, yet six out of seven known actors of *Fortune's Tennis* are traceable with the Admiral's in this period. Of the six, all except Singer, who was certainly a member at the time, appear in the *Battle of Alcazar*, and all except Tailor in *1 Tamar Cam*, while only two appear in *Frederick and Basilea*, though Singer was also a member at the time. This affinity becomes still more significant when we examine the chronology of this sequence, since *Frederick and Basilea* is datable June 3, 1597, while *1 Tamar Cam* belongs to 1602, seemingly late in the year, with the *Battle of Alcazar* fitting in at some point between these extremes. Whatever may be the exact date of the *Battle of Alcazar*, these facts would argue that it, *Fortune's Tennis*, and *1 Tamar Cam* form a group later than *Frederick and Basilea*, June 3, 1597. The reason of this separate grouping in the case of the other two plots is that in the autumn of 1597 Pembroke's company came to coöperate with the Admiral's, thus bringing in many new actors.¹ Presumably the same reason holds for *Fortune's Tennis*. Whatever the explanation, it is hard to see how it could date much, if at all before 1597.

Another less significant point is that Singer is first mentioned with the Admiral's men in a list between entries of December 14, 1594, and January 14, 1595, and could hardly have been a member before the reorganization in the summer 1594.² Thus the plot of *Fortune's Tennis* would appear to date hardly earlier than 1597, and would appear to be wholly impossible for a date before May 12, 1593, as Dr. Tannenbaum must date it.

Since Kyd died before the end of 1594 and under Dr. Tannenbaum's own interpretation would almost certainly not have had any connection with theatrical affairs after May 12, 1593, it would appear impossible that he could have written the plot of *Fortune's Tennis*. But if not that, then the experts, including Dr. Tannenbaum, would assure us not *The Seven Deadly Sins*, nor a part of *More*.

Fortunately, Dr. Tannenbaum's care and acute powers of observation have given us the positive identification of this hand. He points out that "Dr. Greg had noticed (*Shakespeare's Hand*, p. 56) that a few hasty stage directions in the margins of *John-a-Kent* are in the handwriting of C. What he had not noticed (but Miss

¹ *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Vol. xxvi, pp. 82 ff.

² Baldwin, T. W., *The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company*, Appendix I.

Byrne had) is the fact that just about the middle of the wrapper bearing the title there is what Miss Byrne has described, not quite accurately, as the 'scribble of a name, apparently V thomas.' The writing, except the unusually tall English capital V, is now very pale and reads *l g V thomas Thomas* in a penmanship which is unquestionably that of C. It is not unreasonable to assume that these words, being in the handwriting of C. and of the writer of the Puckering letter, are the Christian name of Thomas Kyd, done in an idle moment or while trying out his pen" (p. 48). The first word, of which Dr. Tannenbaum gets only *l* and *g* would appear to be "*legit*." The *e* seems clearly decipherable in Farmer's facsimile, properly spaced and connected to the *g*, with the heavy cross stroke which connects with the left wing of the *V* running through its upper half, and with the end of a line which appears to have been in place when the *l* was made just touching the top of the *e*, these two lines and the dimness having previously obscured the letter. The general outline and possibly the dot of the *i* may also be decipherable. The heavy cross line may have served as the cross of the *t*. The spacing is also correct, though the huge *V* has obscured the last letters by its protecting wing. If the word is *legit*, the phrase means "Thomas (thomas) V has read this," and is the prompter-bookkeeper's docket on the manuscript signifying that it has had his attention, as the other jottings also indicate. There seem to be traces of other writing along the top of the blank space in which C was writing, so that his *l* and his first *thomas* collided with it, in the latter case making such a tangle that *Thomas* was repeated in larger and fairer form. It is highly desirable that an expert examine the original manuscript in the Huntingdon library to see if these conjectures are correct.

Who then was the prompter Thomas V? Taylor, the water poet, tells us in 1638 "I my selfe did know one *Thomas Vincent*, that was a Book-keeper or prompter at the Globe play-house neere the Banck-end in Maid Lane."¹ If Taylor is accurate, Vincent was the prompter at some time after the building of the Globe in 1599. He appears as a musician in the plot of *Seven Deadly Sins*, made by him for Strange's men in 1592. Since he was working for the company by 1592 and as late as 1599, we should expect that he had remained continuously with the company. But his writing the fragment of *Fortune's Tennis* for the Admiral's, seemingly not earlier than 1597, as well as his work on *Kent*, which Sir Edmund Chambers dates about December 1594, would seem to indicate that he had really been attached to the Admiral's and not Strange's during the amalgamation, had remained with the Admiral's for a time after the separation, but had eventually gone to the Shak-

¹ *Taylor's Feast*, Spenser Society, 3rd Coll. pp. 70-1.

sperean company, presumably before June 3, 1597, when another prompter writes the plot of *Frederick and Basilea* for the Admiral's. It is thus desirable to identify the prompters of the Admiral's men, since facts concerning them may give further clue as to Vincent's service. The present evidence as to Vincent's connection with the Admiral's seems contradictory and must await some more decisive fact to clear it up.

But since Kyd did not write hand C, then Dr. Tannenbaum has no evidence (2) to date the play before May 12, 1593, when Kyd was arrested and removed from possible touch with dramatic affairs, on which depends fundamentally Dr. Tannenbaum's interpretation (3) of the purpose of the play, (4) the reason of its incompleteness, and (5) of Tyllney's refusal to license. Further, this evidence furnishes (6) no instance of Kyd's writing after 1587, (7) nor shows that his patron, and consequently the patron (8) for whom Marlowe and Dekker wrote in the early nineties was Strange. Since Dr. Tannenbaum has failed to distinguish between the hands of Kyd and Vincent, one naturally hesitates to accept his identification of the supposedly atheistic disputation as Kyd's in the face of Kyd's positive denial, and especially when we have no authentic specimens of Marlowe's hand. One fears that the points of likeness are due to the fact that all belong to the same professional type of writing. Yet, even though Dr. Tannenbaum's main conclusions fall, still much of the subsidiary evidence he has marshalled in their support has pertinent bearing on the fundamental questions involved, and must be considered in all future attempts to solve this problem.

While Dr. Tannenbaum makes no claim to any addition on hand D (? Shakspeare's), yet he does advance the theory that this author probably had nothing to do with the original version but was called in to help save the play from the waste basket. From this conclusion, he further infers that the play had not originally belonged to D's company. He "would say that the play was originally written by Mundy, Heywood and Chettle, either for the Admiral's or for Worcester's men, and that on its being returned unlicensed (or even before its rejection by Tyllney) it was sold to Strange's men, whose poets (Kyd, Dekker and D) immediately set about revising it. Their labors were hardly begun, however, when Thomas Kyd was arrested on the grave charge of seditious libel." Such a theory is, I believe, impossible, though there is not space to show why here. At least, in view of the known routine of the time it is unnecessary. For frequently, if not always, companies had "billed" the first performance of a play before it had been licensed, in some cases before it had been completed. At least, the company would have its own tentative schedule of performances. When therefore Tyllney returned the play with a demand for

serious alteration, the company would necessarily muster every man who could patch, and hasten the reformatations, so as to lose as little time as possible. It is doubtful whether the whole patching process occupied more than an hour of any author's time, say after the play, though poor Vincent probably spent a long and busy evening writing out the fair form or seeing to its being done. Let us hope that he got a successful (box office test) performance as planned and advertised.

Of Dr. Tannenbaum's claims, we now have left the identification of hand A as Henry Chettle's, and hand B as Thomas Heywood's. Dr. Tannenbaum has been able to show some significant coincidences between known specimens of Chettle's hand and hand A, but the inexpert eye will also see sufficient differences to give it pause till the experts have cleared the matter up. It is desirable too that all other known tests for authorship be brought to bear.

In the case of Heywood, Dr. Tannenbaum is pursuing a rejected suggestion of Dr. Greg's, elaborating the likeness between hand B and known specimens of Heywood's writing, and accounting for the differences by the lapse of time, some twenty years between *More* and the next earliest specimen. Dr. Tannenbaum's arguments seem plausible, but again we appeal to the experts.

While this completes the list of Dr. Tannenbaum's formal claims, we have not touched upon some of his most important contributions. Perhaps the most important is his clear demonstration that contrary to general opinion, the revisions were made after the manuscript had been ordered corrected by the Master of the Revels, though possibly only the prompter Vincent, and his boy Shakspeare (if tradition is correct in assigning Shakspeare the task of prompter's attendant, and if D is Shakspeare's writing) took the orders seriously. They were obliged to, or at least Vincent was, since the task of negotiating a license was his, and he was still intending to cast the play. But he did not cast the play on this surviving manuscript. It would have been absurd for him to attempt to do so, since the manuscript was now no longer clear enough for him to follow when actors forgot their parts. Thus Vincent for practical purposes would have been obliged to make, or have made, a fair copy. Besides, Tyllney had not licensed the present manuscript of the play, so that the revision had to be returned for his license. Our nearest parallel here is *Believe As Ye List*, which seems to have been at least as badly slashed by Herbert as was *More* by Tyllney. But Massinger revised, rewrote, and resubmitted the play, which was passed by Herbert after further purging of offensive details that had escaped even the careful Massinger. Too, orders to omit a scene did not mean it should be omitted from the manuscript, but in the acting. For instance, the deposition in *Richard II* seems to have been a censored scene, but it

remained in some manuscript of the play to make its appearance in better days. Besides, if the dramatists did not want to give up the scene wholly, they could but try to adjust it sufficiently to get by Tyllney on the next reading. It they failed, then the prompter could leave it out of the acting version. While then we have no positive evidence that *More* was eventually licensed and played, since the evidence for that would be on the fair copy, yet none of the evidence yet adduced indicates that it was not. Certainly Vincent at the last stage which could be recorded on the present manuscript was intending to have the play performed. And it is to be suspected that he and the dramatists knew Tyllney and his probable reactions to the political situation much better than do we.

But we have not space for all of Dr. Tannenbaum's really noteworthy contributions to this problem of *Sir Thomas More*. No one can afford to overlook his work, and when the final history of the problem is written, it is safe to predict that Dr. Tannenbaum will receive no mean share of the credit for helping to its solution. It is a most hopeful sign for America when a very able layman, as is Dr. Tannenbaum, both can and will devote himself faithfully and energetically to scholarly problems.

T. W. BALDWIN.

University of Illinois.

A Concordance to the Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, and to the Romaunt of the Rose. By JOHN S. P. TATLOCK and ARTHUR G. KENNEDY. The Carnegie Institution, Washington, 1927. xiii + 1111 pages.

The long-awaited concordance to Chaucer, though a portly volume, would have seemed disappointingly small to Dr. Flügel, whose magnificent plans for a "glossarial concordance" were illustrated before his death by specimen extracts printed in *Anglia* (xxxiv, 354-422; xxxvii, 497-532). But, as the editors of the present concordance point out in their introduction, Flügel was really undertaking a dictionary of Middle English on a scale more elaborate than that of any lexicon hitherto published. Yet it was a dictionary limited to that part of the vocabulary that happened to occur in Chaucer. Valuable as such a dictionary would have been for our understanding of Chaucer, a work of such amplitude on a single author would hardly be justified at a time when no adequate Middle English dictionary exists, and when Chaucer, however much he may tower above his contemporaries, is no longer considered the only begetter of standard English. The editors note (p. xii) that "through the loyalty and public-spirit of his [Flügel's] heirs, his entire manuscript and collections were transferred in 1925 to Cor-

nell University, to be used for the newly projected dictionary of Middle English; under happier stars, it is to be hoped, than those of the 'Glossarial Concordance' projected in 1871." The publication of the present concordance in less than a decade after it had been begun is proof of the wisdom of the editors' decision to start anew with fresh materials, and to abandon any attempt to carry on the older work.

We may expect that a concordance be complete, accurate, and convenient; and the Concordance to Chaucer fulfills all these requirements. The editors have anticipated the difficulties that a new edition of Chaucer might engender by including copious variant readings. The true test of their judgment in this matter will be the next critical edition of a part or the whole of Chaucer's works. But the text of Chaucer is even now in a better state than that of many a modern poet, and the generosity of the compilers in recording variants makes it unlikely that the present concordance will ever become antiquated, even in detail. For example, in the case of *babewynnes* (OF. *babuins*), an almost certain emendation in the *House of Fame*, 3. 99: "Of babewynnes and pynacles," three variant readings of the manuscripts are listed—*babewries*, *babewryes*, and *babeweuries*; other variants, such as *rabewynnes*, and *rabewyures*, are rightly disregarded.

The Concordance is based on the "Globe" edition, which is less familiar than Skeat's text, but has the advantage of being more conservative. One may look up hundreds of lines from Skeat's text in the Concordance, and discover no difference other than a minor variation in spelling and an occasional "which that" of Skeat for a "that" of the "Globe" edition. The chief source of confusion is likely to be in cases where other editors make a division of words different from that in the "Globe" edition. Thus in *Troilus*, iv, 1411: "Whan he for-fered out of Delphos sterte," Skeat and Root have *for fered*, a reading which would make another entry under *feared*. In general, the decision to spell the head-words in modern English makes the concordance independent not only of the vagaries of Middle English scribes, but of the whims and frailties of editors.

Like most concordance-makers, Professors Tatlock and Kennedy have been obliged to give only specimens of the commonest words. The selection of specimens, a particularly delicate task in the case of a poet whose conjunctions and prepositions are so subtly different from our own, has been admirably done. Under *at* I miss the meaning *apud*, as in "For I have ben right now at Deiphebus" (*Troilus*, II, 1480), the predecessor of our modern *at* with the possessive. "I have be shryven this day at my curat" (*D. Sum.* 2095) is ambiguous. Under *the* I miss the article with days of the week (cf. Eikenkel, *Streifzüge durch die Mittelenglische Syntax*, p. 5) as in "Selde is the Friday all the wowke y-like" (*A. Kn.* 1539).

The Concordance is accurate as well as complete. The reviewer has discovered no incorrect references and only one misprint in using it frequently and testing it systematically over a period of six months. This is a tribute both to the editors and the workers who helped them in making the slips. The maker of a concordance, like the modern general, must be judged not only by his own work, but by his ability to organize and supervise the work of others.

The usual practice of concordances has been followed in listing homonyms together. One who, like the reviewer, has had little or no experience in the making of a concordance, is not altogether convinced of the wisdom or necessity of this plan. Must the burden of separating "rose," the flower, from "rose," the verb, and "bear," the animal, from "bear," the verb, be shifted from the compiler to the reader? Professor Lane Cooper estimated that 'a lexical concordance to Wordsworth with an equal number of references would require a volume probably one-third or one-half as large again' as his concordance to Wordsworth (*Concordance . . . to Wordsworth*, p. vii). All who buy concordances will agree that in the case of Wordsworth and Chaucer it would have been unwise to undertake a lexical concordance such as Ellis compiled for Shelley. But is the separation of unrelated homonyms in a language so confusingly full of them as English an encroachment on the lexicographer's function? According to my own estimate, based on the homonyms under the letter B, three more pages would have sufficed for the separation of all the unrelated homonyms in the book. There is really no conflict of principle, for the editors have separated homonyms "for special reasons." By this plan such unhappy collocations as "He mighte doon us bathe a vileynye" and "Faire in the soond, to bathe hire myrily" might be avoided; while "burst," noun and verb, might be kept together.

To be sure, the difficulty of ferreting out the right homonym, for the scholarly reader, at least, is not enormous. But it increases the reader's troubles in the case of a Middle English writer whose words are recorded under their modern spellings. The editors, after experimenting with head-words in mediaeval spelling, adopted the modern spelling because of the lack of a standard Chaucerian orthography. This method is unquestionably the right one; yet it introduces certain complications and anomalies. Since homonyms are listed together, it often happens that what were not homonyms to Chaucer appear together: thus two such different forms as *liggen* and *lye* are found under *lie*; and *egg*, 'incite,' and *ey*, 'egg,' are found under *egg*. Conversely, words that were homonyms to Chaucer are listed separately: ME. *trewe*, 'true,' and ME. *trewe*, 'true'; ME. *sterie* 'start,' and *sterie* 'started.' More important is the fact that the reader must occasionally, in the case of homonyms, go through two processes: first he must determine the

Modern English equivalent of Chaucer's word, and then he must search through the collection of homonyms for the particular word he is after. Desiring to look up Chaucer's use of *bote*, 'remedy,' he must stop to think whether it is a modern word or not, and having found it under *boot*, he must disentangle it from *boot* 'bit.' The two processes thus 'encressen double wise the peynes stronge' of the reader intent on finding every occurrence of a word in Chaucer.

The problem of deciding whether a Chaucerian word is to be equated with a modern one is in itself no easy task. This is especially true of words that have been modified since Chaucer's time in the direction of their etymological originals. Thus *augrim*, *aunter*, *auntrous*, are under their Middle English forms, not under *algorism*, *adventure*, *adventurous*; but *avowtrie*, the only form used by Chaucer, is to be found, strangely enough, under *adultery* (without cross-reference). A similar difficulty arises in the case of the past tenses of verbs which have undergone analogical transformation since Chaucer's time. The past tense of strong verbs which have become weak in modern English is to be found under the Chaucerian strong form: *heelp* (including *holp*, *halp*) not *helped*, *wex* not *waxed*; and when Chaucer already has weak forms as well as strong, under both: *weep*, *wept*. When the past tense of a strong verb has a different strong form in modern English, however, it is usually to be found under the modern form: *stal* is under *stole* (the only Chaucerian *stole* being the noun); but the contrary is true of *boot*, which is itself the heading, not *bit*. The forms of the third class of strong verbs have been especially troublesome to classify. The reader who looks for Chaucer's form under the ordinary modern English past tense will find that he is right in the case of *drank*, *ran*, *sang*, and *won*; but under *rang* he will find a cross-reference to *rung*, under which is listed both *rong* (= *rang*) and *rongen* (= *rung*, pret. pl. and past part.). This apparent inconsistency seems to be the result of the fact that there are no preterit singulars actually spelled *rang*. In the case of some verbs, where the preterit plural differs widely from the singular, the two forms are sometimes separated, as under *rode* and *riden* (another heading *ride* for present and infinitive); and sometimes not, as in *chose*, which includes both *chees* sg. and *chose* pl. The editors rightly remark (p. vi) that 'sometimes the logical thing to do is misleading and inconvenient for everybody, and sometimes the convenient thing is unscientific.' But it is occasionally hard to tell whose convenience they have in mind, the general reader's, the professed student's, or merely their own.

These slight inconsistencies, avoidable and unavoidable, must not be exaggerated. Fortunately they are seldom of practical moment, for the editors provide numerous cross-references. With

a little thought and a little turning of the leaves, everything may be found. Probably the concordance or glossary was never made that had enough cross-references to satisfy the demands of every reader. 'Yaf see gave,' should be paralleled by 'yate see gate.' *Gronte* should be listed, with a reference to *grunted*, especially since the reader is apt to be deceived by Skeat, who defined it 'groaned.' The reader unacquainted with Old English who looks up *rive* might easily miss the preterit *rove*, for there is no cross-reference.

The above comments will be considered, I hope, rather as a measure of the difficulties encountered by the editors, than as carping criticism of their work. Certainly no compiler of an English concordance of this type has had to make so many decisions and solve so many problems as Professors Tatlock and Kennedy. Their difficult task is well done. It is hardly necessary to mention the great value of the Concordance to all lovers of Chaucer. If such a problem as the authorship of the various parts of the *Romaunt of the Rose* can ever be definitely settled, it is likely to be through the use of this volume. But apart from questions of scholarship, the Concordance is a boon to those who delight in pursuing the poet's 'favorite words' and in comparing his diction with that of his illustrious successors in English poetry.

ROBERT J. MENNER.

Yale University.

The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century, by CHARLES HOMER HASKINS. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1927. Pp. x + 437.

This book should appeal to all students of modern languages and to all humanists as well as to mediaevalists. It treats of a period important for every person interested in the history of Western civilization; it presents topics of immediate and pertinent significance; it is written by a distinguished mediaeval scholar internationally recognized not only for the quality of his independent investigations, but also for his comprehensiveness of grasp and wisdom in selections of materials and for his soundness of judgment in evaluating them. On the small, select shelf which holds *A primer of Medieval Latin* and *Speculum* this new volume takes its place as an indispensable *vade mecum* for every young aspirant to mediaeval studies.

The book concerns one century of the Middle Ages, a period characterized despite popular conception to the contrary by "much eager search after knowledge and beauty, much creative accomplishment in art, in literature, in institutions." The author

selects for treatment the twelfth century, the period of the third renaissance of the Middle Ages, following in the sequence of the Carolingian renaissance of the ninth century and the Ottonian renaissance of the tenth century. But he finds no abrupt break, for he posits the term *renaissance* as meaning only a more distinct accentuation of forces which contribute constantly to continuity and change through all periods. Even in crowded summary, this century commands respect and stands the test of comparison with more recent ages:

The epoch of the Crusades, of the rise of towns, and of the earliest bureaucratic states of the West, it saw the culmination of Romanesque art and the beginnings of Gothic; the emergence of the vernacular literatures; the revival of the Latin classics and of Latin poetry and Roman law; the recovery of Greek science, with its Arabic additions, and of much of Greek philosophy; and the origin of the first European universities. The twelfth century left its signature on higher education, on the scholastic philosophy, on European systems of law, on architecture and sculpture, on the liturgical drama, on Latin and vernacular poetry.

Mr. Haskins writes as a humanist interested in the intellectual and æsthetic aspects of the century as revealed through the Latin writings of the period. His aim is to present in outline a history of culture in the twelfth century, exclusive of architecture, sculpture, and vernacular writings. To this end, he projects against the background of earlier cultural history and the intellectual centres as represented by monasteries, cathedrals, and courts, chapters upon Books and Libraries, Revival of Latin Classics, Latin Language, Latin Poetry, Revival of Jurisprudence, Historical Writing, The Translators from Greek and Arabic, Revival of Science, Revival of Philosophy, and The Beginnings of Universities. A carefully selected bibliographical note accompanies each chapter. In a sense, each section is a complete essay and "may be considered in some degree as independent of the rest." To the reviewer, the divisions according to this topical method appear logically maintained except in the chapter on the Latin Language, which is primarily a treatment of grammar and rhetoric. Here a brief discussion of exempla, and some bibliographical references to Latin poetry tend to take the reader afield. Since the purpose of the book is to enable us to approximate seeing the humanistic aspects of the age as a whole, the reviewer regrets that Mr. Haskins felt obliged to exclude Architecture, Sculpture, and Vernacular Literature.

Probably the distinctive contribution in the volume is the discussion of the revival of science through Greek and Arabic translators, an approach for which we are indebted to the independent investigations of the author himself. As he emphasizes, the renaissance of the twelfth century had to do primarily with philosophy and science. Its modernity in certain respects comes home to us in connection with the classical revival of the period: "At its

best it [the classical revival] stood for a harmonious and balanced type of culture in which literature and logic both had a place, but which was hostile to the professional and technical spirit that triumphed in the new universities." And here let us pause to emphasize for the modernist that "the university is a mediaeval contribution to civilization and more specifically a contribution of the twelfth century." The author's discussion of the question of intellectual liberty, under *The Revival of Philosophy*, and his arguments to show the comparative freedom of the thinker lead the reviewer to the general conclusion that the boundaries of freedom of thought are always reached when one goes contrary to the interests, prejudices, or convictions of the period. In the twelfth century, theology was the forbidden ground.

In a journal devoted to the modern languages a word concerning the author's style is pertinent. Mr. Haskins writes a firm, sinewy prose, shorn of verbiage, illustrating in its totality the virtues of compactness, clarity, vigor, power, grace, and ease; a model for all graduate students in the humanities. And woven into this texture are passages characterized by vividness and beauty, such as his description of Mont-Saint-Michel:

Few spots are by nature so set apart for monastic seclusion and religious meditation as this remote rock, cut off from the mainland by tide and shifting sands, and looking out past stormy Breton headlands to the pathless ocean where the sun of mortal life goes down in death.

This book represents a task which needed to be done. We are fortunate in having it done by a scholar rather than by a dilettante. Perchance we shall interpret him rightly through the closing words of Hallam's preface to a similar theme written over a century ago: "My labours will not have proved fruitless, if they shall conduce to stimulate the reflection, to guide the researches, to correct the prejudices, or to animate the liberal and virtuous sentiments of inquisitive youth."

GEORGE R. COFFMAN.

Boston University.

A Contribution to the Study of Fifteenth Century English, I. By ASTA KIHLMOM. Uppsala (A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln) and London (David Nutt), 1926. xxxi+203 pp.

This inaugural dissertation, prepared under the direction of Professor Zachrisson, follows the investigations of Morsbach, Lekebusch, and Fladieck of the elevation of the London dialect to the position of an official language during the 15th and early 16th centuries. This thesis studies the extent to which "the

London usage during this early period was felt as a Standard for the written language in general, such as it was used in, for instance, private communications written by private persons in various parts of England" (p. vii). The published portion of the work deals only with the stressed vowels in words of Germanic origin; a later part will deal with the words of French origin, with consonants, and with the vowels of unstressed syllables.

The sources examined are original letters (rather than those signed by a secretary, whose dialect may be markedly different from that of the signatory) written by well identified persons. As far as was possible in view of the lack of original 15th century letters from the Midland or the North, letters from all parts of England were studied. The social position of each writer was noted and other circumstances that might aid the student in estimating the philological value of the various spellings. The material examined consists of the Paston Letters (Norfolk), the Stonor Letters (Oxfordshire), the Cely Papers (London), the letters of John Shillingford (Devon), and of Edmund de la Pole, Earl of Suffolk.

The main body of the book comprises a detailed and systematic study of the development of each Old English stressed vowel as it appears in the documents studied. In the "discussion" appended to the treatment of each vowel the general student of the English language will find the comments that will be of most interest to him. For instance, *ar* for earlier *M. E. er* is more frequent in these private papers than in the writings of official scribes, who would know and use the traditional spellings even after the sounds they represented had changed. Again, many peculiarities of modern dialects appear in these 15th century documents and are thus shown to be much earlier in origin than has commonly been supposed. The prothetic *y* or *w* developed in such words as *yelm*, *yetts*, *yearth*, *woothe*, *woem* dialect forms of *helm*, *oats*, *earth*, *oath*, and *home* is still preserved in the modern dialect forms of these words.

The conclusion of this study is what was to be expected: the language of these private papers agrees with the official London usage not only in general features, but also in minute details. "It is evident that the London language was felt as a Standard to be followed as closely as possible, and the dialectal deviations that do occur are more or less occasional and generally appear by the side of the 'Standard' forms" (p. 193). The point is made also that the influence of the eastern dialects on the spoken language of London was very strong and that it was through the channel of the Eastern area (the speech of which was more vulgar and colloquial than London speech of the same period) that Northern forms penetrated into the speech of London. More emphasis should have been placed upon the fact that these private papers are

much more modern in their usage than the official documents and that these letters contain the earliest examples of many of the features of the modern English dialects.

J. M. STEADMAN, JR.

Emory University.

America and French Culture, 1750-1848. By HOWARD MUMFORD JONES. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1927. xiii + 615 pp. \$5.00.

The value of this volume is two-fold: first, as an exposition of a practical method for the student of comparative literature to investigate our cultural origins; second, as a pioneer survey of the manifold aspects of French civilization in America from 1750 to 1848. This is the first of two parts; the forthcoming one is to discuss the reception of French literature during the same period, and, if it will exploit the periodicals systematically, its importance will be admittedly great. Professor Jones considers in turn the three main elements that have shaped American culture: "The Cosmopolitan spirit, Frontier spirit, Bourgeois or Middle-Class spirit." With these dynamic forces as a background, the author passes in review American reactions to French migration, language, manners, art, religion, philosophy, and politics. Fortunately, careful distinction is made between interest in France and French influence. The author makes no pretense at having produced a definitive work, and announces unsparingly—but justly—the following deficiencies:

I have had to generalize in many instances from insufficient data and I have had to make long running jumps in various parts of the field, to guess when I wanted to know and to surmise when I would have preferred to prove.

No one, the writer says, has tried to see *The General American attitude* toward things French. Perhaps so—but his attempt to discover one constitutes an *a priori* judgment; besides, he does not sustain this general attitude with convincing proof. The reader will judge for himself whether the outlook of the frontier toward French culture had much in common with that of the Brahmins of Boston. A striking analogy is brought to mind between this work and Taine's *History of English Literature*. Like the latter, Jones has also the problem of culling only such material from a vast storehouse as corroborates the three fundamental factors established at the outset.

If the endeavor to glimpse at French culture from all aspects is a praiseworthy one, it is not always practical or wise. Of necessity, the chapters are of unequal merit. That on the French language in America (most of which had already appeared in *SP.*) is an excellent one, as are those on manners, philosophy, and education. As much cannot be said of the last two, which concern France and our politics; in fact, the book might have gained had the author refrained from discussing a topic so often treated. The first of these chapters leans heavily on the admirable monograph of Bernard Faÿ; the second is superficial. J. might profitably have consulted Miss E. B. White, *American Opinion of France from Lafayette to Poincaré* (New York, Knopf, 1927), had her work appeared a little earlier. The well-meaning ambition to envisage all phases of a civilization must seem a bit extravagant in view of the fact that he has nothing to say of the economic or scientific aspects. Even a glance at our earlier XIXth century periodical literature betrays a profound interest in what is called the golden age of French science with Cuvier, LaPlace, Lagrange, and no dearth of others. The omission of the scientific aspect must appear more grave when we recall the following sentence:

It is not too much to say that in the first half of the XIX century most of the scientific text-books in use in American schools and colleges derived directly or indirectly from the French (p. 484).

But the stoutest criticism will give way before much that is admirable in the book. The text is well buttressed with references. The style is condensed, but none the less lively. To be lucid while endeavoring to show the play of a changing French culture against a rich American background is difficult indeed; but J. is to be commended for revealing the complexity of the elements that enter into our national life. The occasional summaries of preceding chapters (pp. 73, 215, 385, 567) are, thus, at once helpful and necessary since he is desirous of keeping before the reader the vicissitudes of French ideas in regard to each of the dominant American "spirits" or forces. The bibliography is opulent, but uncritical. In the impressive list of magazines, the author should have indicated the place of publication so that the section of public opinion represented might better be determined. All in all, we insist upon the significance of this volume. It has crystalized a great mass of literature relating to our contacts with France from 1750-1848, "... in the hundred years we were closest to that interesting people"; it has formulated a program for future students of the field that will doubtless further research; it has made some use, at least, of periodicals; it is, finally, the first courageous incursion on a generous scale into this attractive subject by an

American scholar. The author could not hope to have accomplished more.¹

MAURICE CHAZIN.

Johns Hopkins University.

Zigzags autour de nos parlers. Par LOUIS-PHILIPPE GEOFFRION.
Quebec, 125 rue de la Claire-Fontaine. Vol. I, 1925, 222 pp.;
vol. II, 1925, 229 pp.; vol. III, 1927, 230 pp.

As the title suggests, this work contains the results of discursive rambles, which the author made in the realm of French Canadian language. Within the compass of these three volumes we find a study of the origins and history of some 340 vocables or idioms in use among the French of the Province of Quebec. This contribution to French philology, in the form of detached notes published in Canadian newspapers, presents the hybrid character of a work whose author is both dilettante and apologist. Indeed, he seems to have cherished the hope of writing a *Défense et Illustration* of the local language. There is no organization whatever of the subject-matter. He is satisfied with tracing back the history of words or idioms in current usage among his people by means of numerous quotations from medieval, modern, and contemporary French authors. From the scientific standpoint, one will certainly regret that the explanations are confined to French rather than comparative Romance philology. Such limitation of scope renders impossible the clearing up of obscure points which might otherwise have been elucidated. The information contained is generally sound and valuable even if, in certain cases, explanations are far-fetched and not very convincing. For instance, in connection with the entries *brayer*, *braye* (I, 26); *torchon*, *guipon* (I, 61), much overworked analogy has furnished M. Geoffrion with remarks which are ingenious but decidedly questionable. Furthermore, it might be better to consider the omission of *de* and the definite article in *Rue Claire-Fontaine* (II, 136) a remnant of the old genitive case rather than the result of the contamination of the proper noun *La Fontaine* and the common noun *fontaine*. A more serious objection has to be made to the author's thesis concerning anglicisms.

¹ The delicacy of pronouncing final judgments on our intellectual debt to France will become evident when we compare the conclusions of Mr. J. and Miss White, whose recent work was referred to above. According to her, French influence has been great. For Mr. J., France has had vogue rather than influence (p. 572). So that we are left to the sorrowful observation once made by Ammianus Marcellinus: The work has still to be done.

Of all the parasites dangerous to French speech in Canada, English words or constructions, creeping into everyday language, are most to be feared. For the last half century purists have been intent upon eradicating them. Some of these purists, overzealous in their task, saw traces of English where none were to be found. M. G. finds much satisfaction in referring to the errors of his predecessors in this direction but he himself makes deductions which are open to criticism. Failing to take into consideration that modern usage is the criterion of standard French, he sees French survivals and not anglicisms in those French Canadian words which can be traced back to old vocables which were taken over into English before they died out in French. In a country where English and French are spoken side by side, one cannot affirm so unhesitatingly that *plombeur*: *plombier* (I, 98); *grosserie*, *grosneur*: *épicerie*, *épicier* (II, 174); *bâdrer*: *ennuyer*, *vexer*, *contrarier* (II, 213); *bède*: *lit* (III, 189), are survivals from the older language rather than English influences. For additional examples of anglicisms, cf. *argents* (I, 6); *anxieux de* (I, 57); *réaliser* (I, 64); *monter sur le banc* (I, 153); *identifier*, *identification* (I, 156); *banqueter* (I, 177); *bargaine* (I, 192); *dépêche des affaires* (II, 37); *payer*, *être payant* (II, 64); *flasque* (II, 112); *clair* (II, 93); *examen de témoin*, *examiner un témoin* (II, 112); *cloque* (II, 144); *jugement renversé* (II, 161); *dans la ligne de* (II, 170); *ponce* (III, 13); *cope* (III, 73). Since these vocables or expressions are found in old French texts or in modern authors, M. Geoffrion does not consider them anglicisms. He also attempts to justify obsolete words or idioms on the ground that they are used by good writers or found in standard dictionaries. But the employment of unusual vocables or constructions by reputable authors does not necessarily vouch for their conformity to the genius of the language. On the other hand, Littré, Bescherelle, or Hatzfeld and Darmesteter register the most common usages without, for that, approving or condemning them. Ample bibliographical references precede vol. I; however, one may wonder why the author has not thought it fit to refer either in the bibliography or in the body of the work to the contributions of Clapin, Dionne, and Blanchard, which deal specifically with the French Canadian speech.

Such as they are, in spite of their limitations, the *Zigzags* can be considered one of the most extensive studies ever published on the subject. We may point out that the first two volumes were crowned by the French Academy and the Quebec government. In his capacity of Secretary of the *Société du Parler Français au Canada*, the author had access to the best of sources, the great wealth of information collected in view of the publication of an exhaustive glossary of the local language. Although not a work of philological synthesis, the specialist will undoubtedly find in

these three volumes a considerable amount of valuable material which may be used with profit in the scientific treatment of this special field of French philology.

J. M. CARRIÈRE.

Marquette University.

Anatole France, the Parisian. By HERBERT LESLIE STEWART.
New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1927. xiv + 394 pp.

This handsome and well-printed volume of some 400 pages is a serious study of Anatole France. It scarcely lives up to its title, however. Chapter II is indeed entitled "The Child of Paris," but the rest of the book has little direct bearing on the subject. Child of Paris Anatole France certainly was in many ways, but in so far as Professor Stewart's work is concerned, he comes nearer the mark when, near the end of his study, he refers to France as "a cultured pagan of classical antiquity, who had chanced to be born in Paris" (p. 375).

The book as a whole hardly conveys the impression that the author has a sufficient knowledge of French literature to provide an adequate background for his work. Instances of this lack of background are not infrequent. The time-honored misquotation of Montaigne, "pillow of doubt," is given (p. 222). (Montaigne said: "l'incertitude," which, as was long ago pointed out, is the very opposite of doubt.) Leconte de Lisle's tremendous *Poèmes barbares* are dubbed "graceful" (p. 41). We are informed that La Bruyère was not a member of the Académie and that Daudet unsuccessfully applied for admission (p. 84). Zola is termed, without reservation, "this realist" (p. 246). Nor has the author always understood what he has read in or about France. *Crainquebille*, a masterpiece, is misappreciated to fit the purpose of the chapter "The Sceptic as Social Reformer" (p. 131). The point of the conclusion of *Thaïs* is missed or misstated (p. 250)—again, perhaps, to fit a theory. The statement about Ronsard and the 19th century (p. 383) is in flat contradiction of what France really wrote and of the facts. In matters of history, the Republic was considerably more than "twenty" years old in 1897 (p. 111), and the dreadful charity bazaar fire of 1897 was not in a "cinema theatre." (p. 231). Finally, it is difficult to believe that Anatole France, born in 1844, had "often seen" Chateaubriand, who died in 1848 (p. 39).

Errors in the forms of French words, while slight, are unnecessarily frequent. Following common mistakes, the name Sully Prudhomme is endowed with a superfluous hyphen (p. 84) and those of Heredia (p. 41) and Clemenceau (passim) with equally

superfluous acute accents. On the other hand, Micromégas (p. 228) and conséquence (p. 264) lose theirs, while Saint-Germain-des-Prés (p. 52) twice masquerades as "Près." Chateaubriand's *Itinéraire* is pluralized through a misunderstanding (p. 39). The author has a trick of using French words—*préfet*, *régime*, *libre penseur*—where good English equivalents exist. The horrendous *nom-de-plume*, neither French nor English, mars p. 326. Cousin's *Du vrai, du beau et du bien* is quoted as *Le vrai, le beau, le bon* (p. 356). The only English misprint noted is *book* for *took* (p. 292).

A serious defect in Professor Stewart's work is the implicit confidence that he seems to put in the chatter of Brousson, the dismissed secretary of France, while Gsell's far more serious book is utilized comparatively little. He calls Brousson "very candid" (p. 159); other epithets might easily occur to the reader of this *chronique scandaleuse*. (In a recent review, Paul Souday says of this and a succeeding volume: "The two volumes of M. Brousson are simply a work of vindictive hatred. Nothing could be more malicious, more venomous, more questionable.") The author would have been wise to bear in mind the remark of France, quoted by Brousson himself in his preface: "Il y a là-dessous bien de la perversité." Over-reliance on Brousson has perhaps somewhat warped the author's attitude towards the *Vie de Jeanne d'Arc*. It is hardly just to attribute the writing of this history primarily to anti-clerical propaganda; Anatole France's life-long interest in Jeanne is part and parcel of his general interest in the lives of saints and in the lowly and simple-minded.

This book is the work of a professor of philosophy, not of a student of French literature. As such, it is a serious, useful, and, on the whole, sympathetic study of its subject. One gets the impression in reading it that the author likes Anatole France more than he really feels that he should. Unashamed lovers of Anatole France can pardon errors of detail and some injustices in view of the finely appreciative sentence, too long to quote in full, beginning: "One should not lightly disparage . . . a character which gave such notable proof of some of the highest human virtues" (p. 359).

GEO. N. HENNING.

George Washington University.

Pour et contre le romantisme. Bibliographie des travaux publiés de 1914 à 1926. By HENRI GIRARD ET HENRI MONCEL. (Etudes françaises fondées sur l'initiative de la Société des professeurs français en Amérique. 11e cahier.) Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1927. 94 pp.

This bibliography is limited to books written in French and published in book-form. Periodical literature and critical matter written in other languages than the French are, with very few exceptions, carefully eschewed. The three books written in English (Nos. 34, 36, 39), which appear in the section "Influences étrangères," and which form an exception in this all-French bibliography, are at least published on French soil. Of these three, only the last, E. Partridge's thesis, *The French Romantics' Knowledge of English Literature*, fits into this bibliography. Miss Gilman's dissertation, *Othello in French*, might be allowed, inasmuch as it treats in part with Romantic imitations and adaptations of the Shakespearean play, but how can we justify the presence of Clark's book on *Boileau and the French Classical Critics in England* (No. 34) in a list of books dealing with English influence exerted on French Romanticism? Biographical and critical studies of English and German writers, such as Byron (Nos. 41 and 42) and Lavater (No. 30) might be tolerated inasmuch as these books probably also deal, though incidentally, with the influence which these foreign authors exerted on French Romanticism, although the compilers should have given the pagination for those parts of the books listed which have a bearing on the subject, but we fail to comprehend what a book such as *Gœthe en Angleterre* (No. 29) is doing in a section dealing with Germany's influence in France. Neither is it clear what induced the authors to list Professor Reynaud's *Histoire générale de l'influence française en Allemagne* (No. 31) under this rubric, for it is devoted to German influence in France and not to French influence in Germany. The compilers came once out of their exclusiveness and included a study on Théophile Gautier written in French, though published beyond the French frontiers (No. 290).

M. Baldensperger has written a preface for the book, in which he defines the "message" of Romanticism for the present generation. The compilers themselves present, in an Introduction, the contemporary controversy between the admirers and adversaries of Romanticism. In their eagerness to claim victory for Romanticism, they often overshoot the mark. It is doubtful whether the foundation of the Victor Hugo Chair at the Sorbonne could be interpreted as a triumph for the school of which he was the spokesman.¹

¹ The first incumbent of the Victor Hugo Chair was, by the way,

The book under review is almost free from typographical errors.² Notwithstanding its deficiencies, it is a very important bibliographical contribution to the Romantic period, for which all students of the subject should feel deeply grateful.

MAXIMILIAN RUDWIN.

Baker University.

Germany Ten Years After. By GEORGE H. DANTON. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin & Co., 1928. Pp. x + 295. \$3.50.

Mr. Danton's book is the result of a year's residence and travel in Germany. He condenses his impressions and observations in seven chapters, which—although necessarily overlapping here and there but on the whole well rounded in their presentation—take up definite problems such as political and economic reactions, the schools, the universities, etc. The first chapter strikes the dominant cords, varied throughout the book: counteraction against years of intellectual isolation, taxation and lack of funds, 'Abbau,' attainments and shortcomings of the reorganization in progress. Through constant comparison with conditions in the orient and in America the author succeeds in throwing the peculiar character of the German people and their institutions into relief and a keen and yet sympathetic eye enables him to distribute light and shadow with accuracy and justice as far as an evaluating study, which does not aim at giving historical evolution, permits.

Allowance must, of course, be made for present unsettled conditions, leaving room for divergent interpretation and prognostication. The best chapters are, no doubt, those on the universities and schools, which stress the spirit of seriousness, thoroughness, and responsibility still pervading the whole system of German educational institutions as well as the attitude of their teachers and students. In regard to the pedagogical methods of academic teachers a more frankly critical reaction, to my mind, would not have been amiss. The secondary schools have realized their task and are actually trying to lessen the gap between their upper grades and the first university year while no relief has yet been attempted from above. If Mr. Danton prefers the shortcomings of

Fernand Gregh and not the Catholic poet, Henri Ghéon, as has been erroneously stated by Professor Albert Schinz in his article on French literature in the *International Year-Book* for 1926.

² A serious misprint will be noted in Baldensperger's quotations from Goethe: "Le classique est le saint (read: sain), le romantique est le malade."

the German system he seems to overlook the fact that we are trying to remedy our own through splitting off the senior college and attaching it more closely to the graduate school. A compromise between the German and the American plan, such as Lamprecht had in mind, would largely eliminate the present difficulties.

The reforms in German secondary schools have only to a degree been put into practice, not merely on account of the economic stress but also due to the fact that the Germans (here as in every other phase of reorganization and re-orientation) proceed from the bottom up and not from the surface down. They do not (as frequently our pedagogues) begin to experiment light-heartedly, but the whole structure must rest on the solid basis of a changed spiritual outlook. Excellent theoretical preparations have been instituted, their realization, however, will also depend on the convictions of a new generation of teachers. For the feeling of educational responsibility has an almost religious note in it, which would make a German consider the usual religious frills of an American commencement exercise, such as invocation and benediction, as derogatory to the sacredness of his own calling.

It is hard for the American, on the other hand, to understand the solemn and serious attitude of the young people in Germany toward the youth movement, which Mr. Danton underestimates considerably, owing, no doubt, to the enormous difficulty in getting a clear conception of this problem from the contradictory aims and organizations, evidenced in all pertaining publications and manifestations. And there exists a similar difficulty in the sounding of contemporary German literature, the currents of which are still very elusive. Von der Leyen's, Naumann's, Witkop's, Diebold's recent publications and other studies might have furnished Mr. Danton with clearer conceptions of the trend in which the younger movements are developing. Werfel and Jahnn, at any rate, should not have been consistently misspelled as Werfels and Jahn.

German acting, it seems to me, must needs deviate from American ways on account of the evolution toward the idealistic and typifying presentation, which more and more crowds psychological and individualizing methods into the background. It is not the heritage of Goethe's tradition surviving but a new development which reverts to a different form.

As to Shakespeare performance it may hardly be called 'slight' in comparison with twenty-odd years ago. The *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* of 1906 records 1258 presentations by 186 theaters for 1906 as against 1683 by 169 theaters in 1926, and 1905 by 181 theaters in 1925; 23 different works with *A Midsummer-Nights Dream* (364 times), *The Merchant of Venice* (151 times) and *Othello* (105 times) heading the list in 1906; *Twelfth Night* (236 times), *The*

Taming of the Shrew (208 times), and *Othello* (189 times) heading the list of the 28 dramas in 1926. I doubt whether any other country can equal that.

But to turn back to the general tenor of the study and its merits, I wish to emphasize once more the great difficulty of obtaining entirely accurate information on every phase of its discussion. Without a certain courage of braving blunders such a book could not be written. It will prove helpful and stimulating to the general reader as well as to the teacher of German.

ERNST FEISE.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Ordbog over det danske Sprog, grundlagt af VERNER DAHLERUP.

Femte Bind, Flyve-Frette; Sjette Bind, Fri-Gramvægt; Syvende Bind, Gran-Herpaa; Ottende Bind, Herre-Høvævl; Niende Bind, I-Kansler. Copenhagen, 1923-1927. Gyldendalske Boghandel.

It is good to record the fact that the great Danish dictionary is proceeding steadily and bids fair to be done within a reasonable term of years. In this respect it compares favorably with the *Oxford Dictionary*, and even more so, of course, with the German and Swedish efforts at monumental dictionaries of their respective tongues. The sponsors of the Danish project wisely made their goal modest enough to be attainable within a lifetime. The dictionary is not so exhaustive as that being got by the Swedish Academy, but it is much further along!

The beginnings of the Danish *Ordbog* reach pretty far back, it is true. Verner Dahlerup began his collections as early as 1882, although it was not until 1901 that the Gyldendalske Boghandel persuaded him to sign a contract to prepare a dictionary for the general public. From 1901 to 1915 the collection of material proceeded, but it became more and more clear that the work would have to be put on a broader basis if it was to succeed, and in 1915 the Danske Sprog og Litteraturselskab took over the enterprise. With the increase in funds, and in the number of workers, that this change involved, it became possible to set up and put through a practical program. The first half-volume, consisting of columns 1 to 640, was published in 1918, the second half-volume, with columns 641 to 1184, followed in 1919, and, beginning with the year 1920, a whole volume has come out each year.

The earlier volumes were brought out under the general supervision of Verner Dahlerup, but the volumes under review belong

to a later period in which the general editorship rests in the hands of a board of editors, of whom H. Juul-Jensen and Johs. Brøndum-Nielsen need special mention. One can only stand back and marvel at their achievement. The accuracy, clarity and conciseness of the lexicographer of today are beyond all praise, and the Danish *Ordbog* measures up to the high standards of the present, thanks to the labors of the editors and printers, who know what to do and do it. By way of contrast, I may be permitted to quote the first article of the 1870 Dictionary of the Swedish Academy:

A, bland alla ljud det första, klaraste och skönaste, innehar främsta rummet i de flesta alfabet.

The progress of science since those days is evident!

And yet the reviewer is never to be satisfied! In looking over these weighty and closely packed pages, I have often wished that typographical devices had been more freely used to aid the reader in his search for the particular thing he is looking for. Variations in the size of type, paragraphing and the like doubtless add a good deal to the expense of publication, but they are a boon when the article under scrutiny is long and made up (as a long article usually is) of a large number of items.

But it would be ungrateful to dwell on such points. The *Ordbog* is a work of great distinction, and its editors and publishers deserve generous recognition for their successful prosecution of an enterprise so exacting in its requirements and so meager in its material rewards. Let us see to it that the spiritual rewards, so far as we can give any, are all the greater.

KEMP MALONE.

The Johns Hopkins University.

Catalogue of the Icelandic Collection Bequeathed by Willard Fiske.

Additions 1913-26. Compiled by HALLDÓR HERMANSSON.
Cornell University, 1927. Pp. 284. 4 to.

This is a supplement to the Catalogue reviewed in an earlier number of this Journal.¹ Naturally, the present publication comprises, in the main, books and pamphlets of recent date. As to the nature of these accessions, the Preface has this to say: "... the Icelandic presses have been very active during this recent period. They have increased in number, and with them the literary output. It does not, however, follow that quality necessarily has kept pace with quantity. Many well-known authors whose works

¹ *MLN.*, 1915, p. 23.

severally filled a column or more in the first Catalogue have now passed away, and consequently often occupy but little space in this; yet others have come forward to take their places, and not a few of the new authors have already acquired some reputation, even outside the limits of their own country. Poetry still flourishes in the land of the old skalds, but it is now closely pressed in the race by novels and short stories, which have become fashionable of late; and even the drama, in a country without professional actors, is well represented. Foreign fiction has been translated at a rapid rate, though metrical versions of foreign verse are comparatively few. Religious writings, at least of the more orthodox kind, do not fill as much space as before, but new cults like spiritualism and theosophy seem to have many devotees, to judge from their publications. Books on music and musical compositions are also relatively numerous.

"Especially noteworthy is the increase in scholarly works. It is clear that research, historical, linguistic, and literary, has been greatly promoted by the establishment of the National University in 1911.² The writing of text-books in the humanities and the sciences for lower as well as higher institutions of learning is steadily advancing, and these are replacing such foreign books as were previously used. Many of these text-books doubtless find a market also among the general public which in Iceland has always been book-loving and eager for information. Further, the declaration of political independence in 1918 has been followed by an increased output of governmental publications."

The very large material is handled with the same expert skill and care, especially in the matter of cross-references, as in the Main Catalogue. And, as there, the reasoned index is a great help in disclosing references to Icelandic matters in publications that would seem a far cry indeed from Iceland.

Very few misprints have been noted—thus, *sub* Feuillet, Octave, p. 65; *sub* Kinck, Hans (alphabetic order) p. 132; *sub* Kock, E. A., p. 135; *sub* Paasche, F. (Cederschiöld), p. 176; *sub* Pipping, Hugo, p. 181; *sub* Solarljóð, p. 204.

No criticism would seem in order concerning what is, or what is not, in a given collection of books. Nevertheless, when, as in the present instance, cataloguer and curator are one and the same person, it may be pertinent to ask why, e. g., the collection (even under the broadest interpretation) should contain such a long list, occupying over five columns, of translations into several European languages of Tegnér's *Frithiof's Saga*, when this noble work really has very little to do with Icelandic literature; whereas several

² Cf. *The Dial*, 1911, p. 246.

important works by scholars like Gudmund Schütte and Andreas Heusler, directly dealing with Old Icelandic matters, are lacking.

Another inequality which was noted concerns the listing of reprints of some articles and reviews, and not of others, seemingly without discrimination. There cannot possibly be any objection to the separate binding and listing of so important an article as e. g. that of Symons' on King Ermenrich's Death, *ZfdPhil.* 38; or, say, his review of the edition of the Kormáks saga by Möbius, *ibid.* 21; or of other articles and reviews by notable scholars—if it were not for the invidious distinction conferred on authors not so kindly treated. Hence it were better, in a following supplement, to omit altogether the mention of articles in journals which may be supposed to be accessible in any library adequately equipped for the study of Germanic languages and literatures.

LEE M. HOLLANDER.

University of Texas.

Historische Grammatik der niederländischen Sprache. Von M. J.

VAN DER MEER. 1. Band: Einleitung und Lautlehre.

Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1927. ciii + 353 pp.

This is perhaps the most comprehensive historical grammar of a Germanic language that has hitherto appeared, despite the modest assertion of the author in the *Vorwort* that the book "bezweckt lediglich die Unterschiede zwischen dem Neuniederländischen und dem Neuhochdeutschen geschichtlich zu begründen, wobei auch besonders das Augenmerk auf diejenigen Wörter gerichtet wurde, bei denen die Zusammenhänge nicht so nahe liegen."

An introduction of about 125 pages traces the dialectic development of the Dutch language in all former and present colonies and in the mother country from the earliest times down to the immediate present. At the end of this long and valuable introduction is appended a well-nigh complete list of 28 pages of references on the subject matter just treated.

The grammatical section, i. e. the *Lautlehre*, pages 1-235, is clearly arranged. The word material is considered under five main headings: 1. *Die Laute der niederländischen Wörter*; 2. *Die Laute d. französischen Wörter*; 3. *Die L. d. hochdeutschen W.*; 4. *Die L. d. englischen W.*; 5. *Die L. d. indischen W.* Under these captions the sounds are taken up in the regular orthodox way: single vowels, diphthongs, consonants.

What makes this book especially valuable to the students of Germanics is that the cognates for each Dutch word in the Old High German, New High German, O. Saxon, O. English and Modern English, and O. Frisian are given. To be sure English

often receives a stepmotherly treatment as compared with German, but that is to be expected from the purpose of the book as quoted above. The section devoted to the sounds of the French loan-words is most complete and at the same time concise. The same might be said of the chapters on German and English loan-words, altho they are by far not so important as the one on the French loan-words. This part of the book, if not the book itself, might well serve as a model for similar works on the German and English languages. Pages 236-300 contain a large number of special references and *Berichtigungen und Nachträge* with comments. A complete list of the Dutch and German words discussed in the text are given in the *Wörterverzeichnis*, pages 301-353.

Grammars of this kind are a necessary prerequisite for such works on the history of the cultural development of a people as Vossler's well known book *Frankreichs Kultur im Spiegel seiner Sprachentwicklung*. The most recent attempts in some quarters to tackle these and similar problems by trying to dispense with the diligent and laborious work of the *Sprachforscher* are doomed to failure. The study of the development of ideas depends upon that of words. Novalis has rightly said, *Die Sprachlehre ist die Dynamik des Geisterreichs*.

EDWARD H. SEHRT.

George Washington University.

Tennyson, As Seen By His Parodists. By DR. J. POSTMA. H. J. Paris, Amsterdam, 1926. 199 pp.

The object of the author is "to show how contemporary opinion on Tennyson and his works is expressed in parody, and to bring together a representative collection of such parodies." Since the best parodies are already accessible (Hamilton, *Collection of Parodies*, 1884, cites or prints 22 of the 52 given in the Appendix) and since the study yields no unexpected conclusions, the work seems superfluous. Poems dealing with Tennyson's Laureateship, Baronacy, Religious and Theological Poetry, Drama and Jingoism are discussed in turn. No mention is made of James Thomson's "A Real Vision of Sin," "written in disgust at Tennyson's which is very pretty and clever and silly and truthless." These revolting verses possess more literary value than most of the parodies noted, and (written in 1859) qualify Dr. Postma's conclusion that the early parodies were kindly in contrast to those concerned with the poems of about 1880. The statement that Swinburne's "Disgust, A Dramatic Monologue" (parodying "Despair") "has not been reprinted" is incorrect. It appears in Hamilton's *Collection*

and has been reprinted in Mosher's edition of "The Heptalogia," 1898.

A broader treatment of the subject and a wider reading on the author's part might have made the investigation more significant. It is worth noting that Samuel Butler wrote in "The Way of All Flesh": "Tis better to have loved and lost than never to have loved at all," and in "Alps and Sanctuaries": "Mr. Tennyson has well said, 'There lives more doubt'—I quote from memory—'in honest faith, believe me than in half the systems of philosophy,' or words to that effect." Mention should be made of the "topical extravaganza" by William Morris described by Mr. Bernard Shaw (*Dramatic Opinions and Essays*, II, 64), in which one of the chief character parts was Tennyson. The bibliography omits more recent estimates of the poet like those of Faguet and of Nicolson. Such a poem as Miss Edna St. Vincent Millay's "To a Poet that Died Young" suggests the changed attitude toward Tennyson of which the present restricted investigation takes no notice.

Finally it might be argued that Mr. G. K. Chesterton's lines

'Self-Reverence, Self-Knowledge, Self-Control
These three alone'—will make a man a prig,

contain more illuminating parody than most of the many which the author has laboriously transcribed.

L. WARDLAW MILES.

The Johns Hopkins University.

BRIEF MENTION

Un poète bilingue: Adolphe Dumas (1806-1861). Ses relations avec les Romantiques et avec les Félibres. Par FRÉDÉRIC MISTRAL (neveu). Paris: Presses Françaises et "les Belles-Lettres," 1927. 230 p.—Il y a toujours quelque danger à essayer de réhabiliter un auteur secondaire qui a pu être estimé de ses contemporains, mais auquel les générations suivantes n'ont accordé que peu d'intérêt. On risque de donner trop d'importance à ses propres "découvertes" et de porter des jugements littéraires contestables. L'ouvrage de M. Mistral n'échappe pas tout à fait à ces critiques. L'auteur cite avec une grande complaisance une partie considérable de la correspondance d'Adolphe Dumas. Plusieurs de ses appréciations nous semblent sujettes à caution, par exemple:

Il manque à Dumas de ne pas s'être égaré dans les sentiers de Font-Segugne et de ne pas avoir recueilli des lèvres du divin Mistral les leçons d'ordre et d'harmonie qui font que la Renaissance félibréenne dépasse en grandeur et en portée tout le XIX^{me} siècle français.

Cette biographie critique, établie sur des documents sérieux et

présentée avec clarté, est néanmoins agréable à lire et utile. Il est intéressant de suivre la carrière de ce "raté" du Romantisme, qui put se faire connaître des milieux littéraires, dont l'œuvre poétique et dramatique ne manque pas de délicatesse et contient d'admirables morceaux, mais qui n'eut pas assez de force pour s'imposer au grand public. On connaît surtout de lui le vers célèbre de sa pièce, *Le Camp des Croisés* (repr. en 1838) :

Et sortir d'ici bas, comme un vieillard en sort

qui dans la bouche d'un étudiant devint :

comme un vieil hareng saur.

Dans sa vie comme dans son œuvre telles que les présente M. Mistral se retrouve la marque du bouillonnement intellectuel et sentimental qui fut la caractéristique de l'époque romantique. Adolphe Dumas entre dans la catégorie des écrivains de second ordre qui eurent des amitiés célèbres. L'ouvrage de M. nous présente ses relations avec les Romantiques : Chateaubriand, Hugo, Lamartine, Vigny, Sainte-Beuve, Jules Janin ; avec plusieurs de ses contemporains : Nisard, Béranger etc. ; avec les Félibres : Mistral Roumanille, Aubanel. Il sert de trait d'union entre les Romantiques et les Félibres. Sa correspondance contient des renseignements nouveaux et de nombreux jugements intéressants sur les auteurs de sa génération. Dans son ensemble, l'ouvrage est une contribution importante à l'histoire littéraire de la France au dix-neuvième siècle.

LOUIS LANDRÉ.

The Element of Irony in English Literature, An Essay. By F. McD. C. TURNER. Cambridge University Press, 1926. Pp. viii + 109. 5 sh. This all-too-brief study, subtle in discrimination and deft in expression, recalls Meredith's *Essay on Comedy*, of which, indeed, it is a kind of development. Although Mr. Turner touches lightly but surely on the two Samuel Butlers, on Defoe, Arbuthnot, Fielding, Johnson, Gibbon, Jane Austen, Meredith, and Morley's *Gladstone*, his chief concern is with Milton, Swift, and Defoe who made irony "the instrument of prophetic utterance and the major criticisms of man by man." He omits dramatic irony and the irony of fate and confines himself to "direct and simple irony" in prose. He defines "irony in speech" as "a form of destructive criticism that enforces an immediate judgment upon something by placing it without comment in a position to which it should not aspire, but to which we may add, it probably has been aspiring," and insists that, although the writer's motives may be ignoble, "the sting must be dependent on truth for its efficacy." The importance given to Milton is noteworthy and makes one regret that Mr. Turner confines himself to the *Areopagitica* under the misconception that the rest of Milton's prose is

"trivial enough" in subject matter. More essays of this kind—penetrating and unpretentious but not merely appreciative or "popular,"—would be most welcome, particularly from American scholars.

R. D. H.

Etat présent des études rabelaisiennes. Par JEAN PLATTARD. Paris, "les Belles Lettres," 1927. 92 pp. (Etudes françaises, douzième cahier). It is very useful to have a scholar of M. Plattard's knowledge and ability summarize clearly and succinctly the views now held by specialists in regard to a great author. He gives us the history of Rabelais criticism, recounts the life of his author, discusses the peculiarities of each of the five books, R.'s sources, thought, and influence. I miss only a reference to Mr. G. L. Michaud's discovery of Vives as a source of R.'s educational views and a statement in regard to Mr. Clement's recent theory of the composition of R.'s work. These omissions do not, however, seriously diminish the value of this noteworthy contribution to the study of Rabelais.

H. C. L.

Thomas Hardy from Serial to Novel. By MARY ELLEN CHASE. University of Minnesota Press, 1927. 207 pp. This book is a valuable study of the changes which Thomas Hardy made in *The Mayor of Casterbridge*, *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, and *Jude the Obscure* to render them acceptable to the taste of the magazine readers of the eighties. In all three the serial versions were bowdlerized so that no Victorian could take offense. The changes are often meticulous, sometimes far-reaching, and always with an eye to the prudish decencies. And they are sometimes astonishingly drastic as in *Tess* where the magazine version omits the episode of the seduction, an episode which is "the motivating incident of the story." *Jude the Obscure* naturally suffers most.

Miss Chase points out the important issue, "how far are we justified in condemning Hardy's literary ethics?" To answer this question she summarizes in four pages the progress of "realism" in the nineteenth century novel. She then places Hardy "above all preceding or contemporary English realists," and maintains that he "belied his own philosophy of life." The only defense which Miss Chase can present is Hardy's statement that he, like all novelists of his time, was "the slave of stolid circumstance" and that without the approval of the magazines and the circulating libraries he could not have received a hearing. One can believe his statement when one finds a contemporary reviewer referring to the complete version of *Jude* in such terms as "outrageous lubricities," "rancid revelations," and "a bundle of flash stories."

R. P. BOAS.

Mount Holyoke College.

—
r
n
.
,
—
e
s
,
,
.
s
e
—
e

1. a
e
e
e
e
s
n
-
e
g
.
e
t
-
r
r
g
-
e
e
.
.